

February 18

in the Congress. "There will probably be lessened efforts for proposals which are shown to have no chance of success and their supporters will then be faced with a choice between the status quo and some other proposal. Through a process of narrowing the alternatives one of the basic proposed reforms should emerge as the only realistic alternative to the present system. What are now four or five opposing camps will become but two. When this occurs, but not before, I believe we can expect something substantial to be done."

PERSECUTION OF BAHAI

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep concern about the sentences of death and life imprisonment passed by a regional court in Morocco upon members of the Bahai faith because of their religious beliefs. On December 14, in the little Mediterranean town of Nadar, a tribunal sentenced 3 Bahais to death and 11 to long prison terms on charges of rebellion, disorders, threat to public security, formation of criminal association, and endangering religious faith. However, from all reports, the verdict is based on the fact that although nationals of an Islamic state, the accused are members of another faith.

Bahaiism is a religion founded in the 19th century in Persia where its followers suffered persecution and martyrdom for many years. Gradually small communities with nearly 10,000 local centers have been set up in 257 countries, islands, and dependencies including the United States. Proclaiming the oneness of all of the great world religions, the Bahai faith accepts all their major prophets as equally inspired. It believes in the unity of all mankind and uses parts of the liturgy and ceremonies of Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, and other religions. According to Bahai law, followers must be loyal to the governments of the countries where they live.

Mr. President, the harshness of these sentences passed on the members of this faith has aroused heated controversy in Morocco and attracted the attention of the international press. This widespread reaction to the trial has forced the Secretary of Information to issue a statement assuring the public that the verdict is "not definitive" and that the condemned men have the right to appeal. The Supreme Court of Appeal in Rabat is to reexamine the case.

Mr. President, it is most ironic that during the same month in which this trial of Nadar was held, the General Assembly of the United Nations unanimously adopted two resolutions, one calling for an international convention on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance and the other reiterates the Assembly's "condemnation of all manifestations of racial prejudice and of na-

"After this article was written, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, by a 4 to 2 vote, favorably reported S.J. Res. 12 (the district system) with amendments to the full Judiciary Committee on May 21, 1962. The subcommittee amendments would require pledges of electors and invalidate electoral votes cast in violation of such pledges.

tional and religious intolerance." In addition, this resolution calls upon all governments to take steps to eradicate such intolerance. The Moroccan delegate voted for these resolutions. Furthermore, it is most significant that the new Constitution of Morocco guarantees religious freedom. How far religious freedom under the Moroccan Constitution really applies, will be revealed in the coming weeks when the appeal before the supreme court is decided.

Mr. President, I have already been in touch with the State Department about this matter. In my judgment, the U.S. Government should make its views known, whether American citizens are involved or not, as to the importance of religious tolerance and self-restraint throughout the world. I am hopeful that private representations will be made by our Government and that a public discussion of the problem will take place in the United Nations. An enlightened world opinion can play an important role in encouraging fair treatment and respect for individual rights whenever and wherever instances of this kind arise.

CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN A WISE AND COURAGEOUS JURIST

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on February 12, Chief Justice Earl Warren addressed the Georgia Institute of Technology. An excellent editorial reviewing the occasion appeared in the Washington Post on February 15, and I invite the attention of my colleagues to it.

In a forthright and brilliant address, the Chief Justice contended that the law has lagged behind science. In support of his thesis that the law must grow, he said:

Fortunately for us, the Founding Fathers painted with a broad brush. They wrote what they intended to be a living document, not one committed merely to the conditions of that day but one that could function under constantly changing conditions.

The Chief Justice's remarks are those of a man of great courage, wisdom, and depth. I congratulate him.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIPLOMATIC CHIEF JUSTICE

Chief Justice Warren proved himself a shrewd diplomat as well as a courageous jurist when he addressed the Georgia Institute of Technology the other day. Because of the general hostility of the South to his opinions in the school desegregation cases, his Atlanta speech was scanned with special care to see whether he would touch upon controversial civil rights.

Although the Chief Justice himself was given an ovation, "Impeach Earl Warren" signs were posted around the city and the delicacy of the occasion was generally recognized. In these circumstances the Chief Justice merits a high mark for his avoidance of any offense and at the same time his adroit refutation of the basic premise on which the Southern extremists have built their case.

The Chief Justice talked largely about science. It was Georgia Tech's 75th anniversary. His emphasis on the achievements of science and technology won the sympathy

and approval of his listeners. Scientists were given credit for leading the advance of civilization. "It would be foolhardy and impossible," the Chief Justice said, "to declare a moratorium on science as was proposed in the 1930's to cure the problems we then faced. Man must go on to ever-increasing knowledge and action in all fields. He wants to know more about the universe, about himself, and about life. He wants scientific knowledge to be used for the advancement of civilization rather than for its destruction."

Having made an unassailable case for the continued growth of science, the Chief Justice lamented that his own profession—law—has not kept pace. Further progress in science demands a "peaceful setting in both domestic and world law. A world without law is hell-bent for destruction with or without scientific discoveries." By this logical route the Chief Justice arrived at the conclusion that the law too must grow:

"It would be equally foolhardy and likewise impossible to declare a moratorium on emerging jurisprudence, as it struggles to meet the challenges of our time, which are so different from those of even our immediate ancestors, and even of our youth. Fortunately for us, the Founding Fathers, painted with a broad brush. They wrote what they intended to be a living document, not one committed merely to the conditions of that day but one that could function under constantly changing conditions—even those we have today and those we will have in the generations to come."

In thus asserting that change in the law of life and that it must apply to government as well as science and that the Constitution makes allowance for growth of the law, the Chief Justice was undercutting the basic premise of his most extreme critics—that the Constitution means only what the Founding Fathers intended it to mean at the time it was written. But he did it so adroitly and so persuasively that none could have taken offense, many applauded and some extremists within and without his audience may have been shaken in their blind adherence to an untenable view.

INVESTIGATION OF SOVIET MILITARY BUILDUP IN CUBA

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, an arm of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has announced a much needed investigation into the Soviet military buildup in Cuba. This investigation, I am glad to say, will be under the direction of the able Senator from Mississippi, Senator JOHN STENNIS.

Under his leadership and direction, the country is assured that the hearings will develop all the available facts and will contribute greatly toward the formation of a firm national policy which will protect our national security.

Senator STENNIS has had many difficult assignments in the Senate and he has handled them with thoroughness, diligence, success, and great and lasting benefit to the Nation. It is fortunate that we have a man of his caliber to serve as chairman of such an important and far-reaching inquiry.

Several days ago, I had the pleasure of reading the article "The Passing Scene," by William S. White, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of February 4, 1963. I commend its reading to every Senator and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

Irwin then decided that the principal obstacle to the coalition was the false assumption by electors that they were obligated to vote for Nixon. He then wired each Republican national committeeman and each State Republican chairman and urged them to release the Republican electors from any feeling of moral obligation to vote for Nixon so they could join the coalition. He received six responses, three of which were sympathetic but none offering assistance. The high point of Irwin's effort was the New Mexico committeeman's response that he had taken up the matter with party leaders at the Republican National Committee level, and that although they favored the move, they felt it should not be sponsored by the party organization.⁴⁶

Irwin and Harris bombarded electors with literature urging them to cast "free votes" as their constitutional right and duty, but on December 10, all Republican electors except Irwin himself stood firm and voted for Nixon. Along with the 14 unpledged electors of Alabama and Mississippi, Irwin voted for Senator Brad.

Harris and Irwin concluded that his vote had served to educate people to the freedom of electors and immediately started working toward 1964. In a post-mortem form letter of December 30, 1960, Harris laid out plans for a similar effort for 1964 and urged friends of the movement to begin now to arrange to become presidential electors.⁴⁷

As a result of Irwin's actions, Oklahoma election laws were amended in 1961 to provide that electors shall be chosen by State party conventions, that each must sign an affidavit that he will vote for the party nominees, and that violation of the oath is a misdemeanor punishable by \$1,000 fine.⁴⁸ The fine is the only means of enforcing the oath. If an elector is willing to incur the fine or wishes to contest the constitutionality of the law, he could still vote for someone else and his vote would be so recorded. Mr. Irwin testified that the prospect of such a fine would not have deterred him if there had been such a law in Oklahoma in 1960.

In the emotionally charged climate of Presidential elections, circumstances are not at all inconceivable where enough electors might follow Irwin's example to change the result of an election. Considering the excess-baggage nature of the elector, why should any risk be taken that a few individuals could someday miscarry an election when they have long since ceased to serve their intended purpose and are at best an imperfect conduit?

It is too bad the elector cannot be eliminated by a constitutional amendment which said nothing more, but this is not possible. Any amendment which eliminates the elector but retains the States' electoral votes must include some means for translating popular vote pluralities into electoral votes.

The minimal amendment would seem to be one which provides that the State's electoral vote will be automatically awarded to the winner of its popular vote as has been the virtually uniform practice for 135 years. In much the same manner as electors' votes are now certified to the Congress, the vote of the people for the candidates could be certified directly. Ample time could still be allowed for resolving election contests at the State level before certification of results. In fact, more time could be allowed and the possibility of resolving disputes in the Congress could be reduced because of the elimination of the intermediate step of electors meeting and voting.

This straightforward proposal meets opposition from two sources. One school of thought resists incorporating the unit-rule system in the Constitution. They feel that this might freeze this system for a number of years and harm the chances for more substantial reform. I doubt this. The public's view of such an amendment would be that it was directed simply at the office of presidential elector and not at any broader problem. In any event, this improvement is sumciently worthwhile of itself to justify the slight risk of hampering further reform.

A second source of opposition is the few who believe the presidential elector to be a worthwhile office which ought to be retained. These are not merely the tiny number of extremists who want the elector to exercise his independent judgment and choose the President. Some few believe the elector is essential to preserving State control of decentralization of presidential elections.⁴⁹

I have considered this argument carefully but cannot agree. Just as State law and the two-party system are now trusted to produce elections of presidential electors, they can also be trusted to produce elections of presidential candidates. A corrective amendment of the type I have mentioned would simply guarantee to the people of each State the right to vote directly for the President, just as they now do for Congressmen and Senators. Voting qualifications for presidential elections could also be left expressly to State control as could regulation of the times, places, and manner of elections. The nominating process is now extra-constitutional and would continue to be so. Just as State law now determines how electors get on the ballot, State law could as easily prescribe how the names of presidential candidates get on the ballot. In 33 States which have so-called short ballots, it is the names of presidential candidates, not the electors, that now appear on the ballot.

If he functions as expected, the elector is only a conduit through which the popular will is conducted and a more reliable conduit is readily available. The popular vote of each State can be transformed directly into the electoral vote counting process. We now have four steps: (1) The people elect electors in November; (2) the electors meet and elect the President in December; (3) the States certify the electors' votes to Congress; and (4) the Congress counts and certifies the final result in January. This proposal simply eliminates the second step and requires the States to certify their popular vote totals to Congress where it is simple arithmetic to count the electoral votes accordingly. Legally and constitutionally, we do not have a President-elect until December. If the electors were eliminated, we would have a President-elect in November.

Should the elector be retained for the possible exercise of his constitutional discretion in this interim? There is no conceivable situation where the elector might exercise his discretion which could not be handled better in some other way. If the successful candidate dies between the November election and December electoral college meeting, party regulations and State law now provide methods which direct the elector how to vote. Once the electors meet and vote, we now have the same situation until Congress convenes as we would have without electors from the popular election until Congress meets. No new problem or vacuum would be created.

Elimination of electors would also eliminate the use of unpledged electors as occurred in two States in 1960. In a sense, this

was a return to the system contemplated by Hamilton and the Founding Fathers; but almost everyone today believes that the American people should elect their President. More important, unpledged electors should be precluded because of their potential for manipulation and balance-of-power bargaining in a close election.

An amendment which abolished electors could also improve the present provision for contingent elections in the House of Representatives. If the electoral vote fails to produce a majority for any candidate, the Constitution now places the election in the House of Representatives with the delegation of each State having one vote. In 1800 and 1824 our Presidents were elected in this manner. Since each State's vote is determined by the majority of its delegation, if a delegation is evenly split, the State would lose its vote. It is also unfair to give a one-member State delegation the same voice as the 41 member delegation of New York. The opportunity for deadlock and third party balance of power is also apparent. Most proposed amendments would correct this inequity by substituting election by a joint session of the House and Senate with each Member having one vote. This would give each State the same relative weight that it has in the electoral vote.

Indications are that the House would not object to sharing this responsibility with the Senate. In fact, after the Adams-Jackson-Crawford deadlock of 1824,⁵⁰ the House adopted a resolution urging that some provision be made so that election of the President could never again devolve upon the Congress.

An amendment aimed at electors and contingent elections which accepted the unit rule would at least perfect the present system as it is generally expected to function. It would provide a certain and uniform system which could not be manipulated from State to State or from election to election. In urging such an amendment, one scholar calls it a "housekeeping amendment."⁵¹ This approach was supported by President Kennedy as a Senator⁵² and by the Department of Justice in our 1961 hearings.⁵³ It has also been endorsed by an influential bar association.⁵⁴ This amendment would at least put our present electoral house in order while we continue the debate of whether to rebuild its basic structure.

CONCLUSION

I would not attempt to predict which of the possible reforms may become law or when this may occur. It has been 158 years since the constitutional method of electing the President was touched in any respect and it would be most presumptuous to make specific claims for the future. However, I do believe the climate for electoral reform is improving perceptively and that some of the most serious past obstacles are being removed.

Division among proponents of reform should lessen as a result of the current consideration of the subject by the public and

⁴⁶ Alaska, Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, and Wyoming each have one representative.

⁴⁷ Henry Clay was third in the popular vote but had fewer electoral votes than Crawford. Since the choice in the House was limited to the top three, Clay was not included.

⁴⁸ Burns, "A New Course for the Electoral College," New York Times, Dec. 18, 1960 (magazine), p. 10, cols. 1-4.

⁴⁹ S.J. Res. 132, 85th Cong., 1st sess. (1957).

⁵⁰ See testimony of Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Assistant Attorney General, in hearings, supra note 2, at 371.

⁵¹ Resolution of the Bar Association of the City of New York, Jan. 16, 1962.

⁴⁶ Id. at 617.

⁴⁷ Id. at 607.

⁴⁸ Oklahoma Statute, ch. 28, secs. 519-522 (1961).

⁴⁹ American Good Government Society, "How Should the President Be Elected?" 12 (1961).

morning was offered by Rabbi Theodore Lewis, of Touro Synagogue, in my home city of Newport, R.I. Touro Synagogue is the oldest synagogue in the United States, and it is this year marking the 200th anniversary of its founding. It stands today as a symbol of an often-forgotten right in American society—the right to be different.

It is most fitting that we note this American right and this anniversary today because this week has also been designated as Brotherhood Week, a time when we pause to extend the hand of friendship and understanding to all Americans whatever their differences of race, color, or creed. Rabbi Lewis comes to us today as the living embodiment of all these traditions, handed down now through two centuries of Touro Synagogue's proud history of service to her congregation, to our city, and to the Nation.

I am happy indeed to welcome him to the Senate today.

RATIFICATION OF ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT BY MONTANA AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on February 7 I announced that the legislatures of six States had approved the anti-poll-tax amendment which the 87th Congress submitted for ratification last year.

Today, Mr. President, I am happy to announce that the legislatures of two more States have ratified the amendment, making eight States in all which have acted favorably. They are the State of Montana, which approved its ratifying resolution by a vote of 51 to 4, the Montana Assembly having approved its resolution 6 days earlier, on January 22, by a vote of 56 to 37; and the State of California, whose legislature, I have been informed, has approved the amendment, the California Senate by a vote of 34 to 0 and the California House by a vote of 70 to 3, final ratification becoming effective on February 7, 1963.

Mr. President, I especially wish to express my appreciation to our distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who directed much time and effort in the last few weeks to working with the leaders of the Montana Legislature in obtaining favorable action on the amendment. His assistance last year in obtaining Senate action here was indispensable.

I also wish, Mr. President, to extend my appreciation to my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], who cosponsored, vigorously supported, and has worked equally hard for ratification of the amendment by the legislature of his State.

Also, Mr. President, I wish to express my equally warm appreciation to the two distinguished Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. ENGLE], who also have worked valiantly from the very beginning in truly bipartisan spirit to obtain the gratifying results which have occurred in their great State.

SUBSIDIZATION OF BOHEMIA LIBRE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on February 8, 1963, the Washington Daily News published an article entitled "Has CIA Killed Anti-Castro Mag?"

The article describes the publication Bohemia Libre and the extent of its subsidization by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. The article reports that the subsidy apparently has been withdrawn.

At one point the article states:

According to this magazine's staffer, Bohemia Libre furnished a U.S. Senator with photos of the Russian buildup in Cuba and that didn't help the administration either. The Senator he named is currently a Democrat.

I do not know why my name was not used directly by the newspaper, when it was the senior Senator from Oregon who obviously was involved.

To set the record straight, I wish to say that these photographs were not furnished to me; they were offered to me. I responded by suggesting that the pictures be taken to the appropriate intelligence agencies of the U.S. Government. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that was the only appropriate response that I could make, or should have made, to the offer of the photographs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the newspaper article, the telegram I received on January 24 from the publisher of Bohemia Libre, and my reply to him dated January 30.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 8, 1963]

DEATH OF A BOHEMIAN—HAS CIA KILLED ANTI-CASTRO MAG?

Bohemia Libre, sensational anti-Castro weekly magazine, has quit publishing and some say the CIA blew the whistle on it. At any rate, publication has been suspended. For how long, nobody knows; it may be forever.

Reports from Miami's Cuban colony are that the Central Intelligence Agency had been subsidizing it, and a couple of weeks ago, got tired. CIA itself doesn't care to discuss rumors.

Bohemia, one of the most spectacular and successful Spanish language periodicals in the Western Hemisphere when it was published in its palatial plant in Havana, idolized Castro both before and after he took over Cuba.

FERVID SUPPORT

During Bohemia's Havana days, its odd-ball publisher, Don Miguel Angel Quevedo, from his exotic modern office paneled in rare woods, complete with lavish washroom with lavender bidet, directed uncritical and fervid support for whatever Fidel said or did.

Bohemia gave U.S. newsmen covering Cuba—such as the famous Latin America Reporter Jules duBois of the Chicago Tribune—the hero treatment as long as they sympathized with Castro's revolution. When they became disillusioned, Bohemia exposed the same U.S. reporters as spies, agents, and colonels in the CIA.

Finally Castro's Red-glared eyes covetously focused on Bohemia's expensive printing

plant and Publisher Quevedo packed his bags and barely made the plane.

So he joined the exiles.

Bohemia thus became Bohemia Libre in exile and in sheer vitriol outdid all other Castro critics (no mean feat, these days).

IRONY

It is an irony, say Cuban exiles, that Bohemia now is portrayed in the very role it accused U.S. newsmen of playing: agent of the CIA.

There's no doubt that Bohemia Libre's spectacular format and content—it's a sort of hot-licks, Police Gazette version of Life magazine—made effective propaganda in several Caribbean areas, as well as among Cuban exiles in the United States, at least until the Bay of Pigs disaster in April, 1961.

There is also no doubt that since then, it has been not so sharp a tool. But, there is also no doubt that the Red propagandists in Havana would crow over its final demise.

Here are several versions of why Bohemia hasn't been going to press recently:

1. A cartoon of the Kennedy family scheduled for page 1 on January 1, was so insulting that the CIA lowered the boom.

2. That knowledge of CIA support had leaked so that it had ruined the magazine's effectiveness.

3. That the magazine has simply lost its effectiveness anyway, since the groups it supported lost the Bay of Pigs battle.

4. That if the actual size of the CIA's subsidy of Bohemia Libre got into the hands of Congress, it would embarrass the Kennedy administration—and the CIA—just about as thoroughly as the Bay of Pigs disaster itself.

5. White House adviser Arthur Schlesinger found Bohemia Libre "too conservative," according to one of the magazine's editorial workers, who also said there were financial problems.

According to this magazine's staffer, Bohemia Libre furnished a U.S. Senator with photos of the Russian buildup in Cuba and that didn't help with the administration, either. The Senator he named is currently a Democrat.

A MILLION

As to the size of the alleged subsidy, depending on who's talking, CIA spent more than a million dollars on Bohemia Libre, or spent \$2,500 a week on it for a couple of years, or paid just the office rent—\$2,400 a month.

Bohemia Libre may not be as dead as its recent failures to publish indicate. Bohemia's boss and staff are well known as lively and resourceful people among such interests as sugar, rum and various export firms, and recently Publisher Quevedo was in Puerto Rico reportedly trying to interest the "statehood-for-Puerto Rico" group. Mr. Quevedo also has his eye on certain interests in the Dominican Republic and in Venezuela as possible angels.

So far, reports have it, no angels are flying.

JANUARY 30, 1963.

Mr. MIGUEL ANGEL QUEVEDO,
Editor and Publisher,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. ANGEL QUEVEDO: I have your telegram of January 24 offering me a collection of photographs on Cuba's military strength.

Although I appreciate your support of my course of action in regard to Cuba and the spirit in which your telegram was sent, I suggest that it would be more useful to make these photographs available to the agencies of the Government who are responsible for collecting intelligence concerning Cuba.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

1963

on vocational education and the very great role vocational education can play, but is not now playing, in providing jobs for our young people. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record, and I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EDUCATION, JOB TRAINING VITAL

A few figures quickly gave the dimensions of one of America's critical problems.

In the decade of the 1960's automation and related forms of technical change are expected to eliminate 2.5 million jobs. In the same decade, 28 million young people will reach working age, twice as many as in the 1950's. To give them employment, the Nation will have to create 25,000 new jobs every week. The Nation will also have to see to it that the young people are trained to handle the jobs.

How inadequately job creation and job preparation are now being accomplished is suggested by the January employment report of the U.S. Department of Labor. It shows that 13 percent of the teenagers seeking employment and 9 percent of those 20 to 25 could not find jobs in 1962. For non-whites the problem is particularly serious. The unemployment rate runs in excess of 50 percent for urban Negro boys.

Approximately one young jobseeker out of every three enters the labor market as a high school dropout. He lacks not only job skills but the scholastic background to acquire them. A Department of Labor official who visited Milwaukee recently pointed out that apprenticeship programs were closed to dropouts and that the armed services were rejecting virtually all youngsters who "can't show a high school diploma." He said further that only 5 percent of present unskilled jobs would still exist by 1970.

Retraining is looked to as the hopeful means of preparing workers displaced by automation for new and more demanding jobs. For youths who haven't become workers in any real sense of the word, the hope lies in vocational training—training that will excite young people and hold them until they acquire skills to get and hold good jobs.

How effective is our present vocational training program? Not very, according to many studies. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch calls for reformation of vocational schools. A survey by the Taconic Foundation reports: "It is extremely questionable whether the training absorbed by vocational high school graduates is useful to them in getting employment and advancing on the job."

The Post-Dispatch makes a further point: Last year 44.5 percent of Federal vocational education funds went for agricultural training although barely 1 young person in 15 can look forward to farm labor. At a time when emphasis should be on orderly transfer of people from the land to the city, this allocation of funds makes little sense.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is

anticipated that tomorrow the Senate will consider nominations on the Executive Calendar; committee assignments and selection of chairmen of committees; and also a continuing resolution for the special committees whose authority has expired.

FIFTY-MILE HIKES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, this Nation is periodically swept by various activities known as the latest craze. Currently, as we are all well aware, 50-mile hikes are the thing to do. Mr. President, I am not against 50-mile hikes, for those young enough and well enough conditioned they are probably a worthwhile form of exercise. And certainly anything that calls attention to the need for physical fitness should not be deprecated.

However much some of these hikes may be only publicity gimmicks, not all of them are that alone. I was particularly pleased to learn that when certain young people of my State took up this activity, for example, they added a different twist that gave an entirely new meaning to hiking.

Mr. President, the students at Northwest Center, a junior college in Powell, Wyo., realized that the first 50-mile hikes in that State would receive considerable publicity, and they decided this publicity should be put to good use. So, instead of marching for the glory of the school or club, they marched to publicize the need for clothing for the children of Teraco, Peru, a community high in the Andes Mountains. These students were well aware of the lack of adequate clothing in that remote village because a former student leader, Walter VandeVeegaete, is now serving there in the Peace Corps.

I am most happy to report that this combination of youthful spirits and humanitarian purpose found a sympathetic and enthusiastic reception in the hearts of Wyoming's citizens. These students set out yesterday to walk—in 1 day—from Powell to Cody, Wyo., and return, a distance in excess of 50 miles. And when the eight survivors, including two young women, struggled across the finish line they were met by the news that more than 1 ton of clothing had already been collected and much more was on the way. One of the marchers, incidentally, was Walter VandeVeegaete's sister, Ramona.

Mr. President, we have heard much in recent years about the sad state of our youth. They grow up in luxury, critics say, and are soft and selfish, neither understanding or caring about the traditions that made this country great. The activities of the Peace Corps and the tremendous job done by our youth, in less than normal American living conditions, was the first large-scale event to give the lie to this criticism of our youth.

I would that our adults could match our youth, not only in education, but in ingenuity in ideas.

The activities of the college students in Powell, Wyo., have served as further evidence that our national ideals are still strong in the hearts and souls of our

youth, and that they have displayed typical American ingenuity to further a worthwhile cause. They have demonstrated this in preserving the national ideals which we associate with the history of our country. This is the spirit of cooperation which has helped to build the frontier, whether it be old or new. It is very much alive today.

DEATH OF OTTO D. SCHMIDT, RECIPIENT OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in 1906, while in the service of the U.S. Navy, Otto D. Schmidt reacted heroically to the explosion of a boiler aboard the U.S.S. *Bennington*. For his actions in saving the lives of a number of the crew, he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, this Nation's highest military honor.

From 1922 until his retirement in 1948, Mr. Schmidt was an employee of the post office in Norfolk, Nebr. He walked some 69,000 miles carrying the mail to his neighbors in Norfolk.

Mr. Schmidt served his country honorably both as a seaman and a civilian. On Sunday, February 10, 1963, he passed away. His death reduced the number of those awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor now living to 290, only 14 of whom are peacetime recipients. Mr. Schmidt was the last living Nebraskan to be given this medal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the article about Mr. Otto D. Schmidt, of Blair, Nebr., published in the Norfolk, Nebr., Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be published in the Record, as follows:

EX-NORFOLK MEDAL OF HONOR HERO IS DEAD

Otto D. Schmidt, 78, Blair, the only Norfolk resident ever to wear the Congressional Medal of Honor, died Sunday at Blair after a lingering illness.

Funeral arrangements are pending.

Mr. Schmidt, a retired Norfolk mail carrier, was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor along with nine other Navy men for heroism in the explosion of a boiler in the U.S.S. *Bennington* off the coast of San Diego in 1906.

After the explosion, which killed 113 of the 136 men aboard, Mr. Schmidt ran to the deck and helped rescue some of the wounded. He also went into the blast-wrecked boiler-room and pulled out injured men.

For a few years before World War II, Mr. Schmidt had the distinction of being the only resident of Nebraska to wear the Congressional Medal of Honor.

He came to Norfolk in 1917 and started working for the post office in 1922. He retired August 31, 1948, after having walked about 69,000 miles.

After his retirement at Norfolk Mr. Schmidt went to Blair to live.

He is survived by one son, Dale, of San Monica. He was preceded in death by his wife.

COMMENT ON PRAYER OFFERED TODAY BY RABBI THEODORE LEWIS, OF TOURO SYNAGOGUE, NEWPORT, R.I.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is most appropriate that our opening prayer this

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2285

NEW YORK, N.Y., January 24, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Bohemia Libre magazine congratulates and supports you on Cuban military buildup offering you a sensational collection of photographs received yesterday from underground sources on Fidel Castro's military strength.

MIGUEL ANGEL QUEVEDO:

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, to my mind, this episode emphasizes the whole question of the extent of the subsidization of Cuban exiled groups and publication outlets. It raises in my mind a question of how much it is costing the American taxpayers to keep publications and political organizations of this kind operating among the Cuban refugees.

A still more serious question is, For what purposes does the CIA subsidize them? These Cuban refugees are well known in Congress as a source of allegations about both the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion and, now, the state of Soviet military forces in Cuba. Bohemia Libre modestly calls its own pictures "sensational." With the current spate of congressional reports, as opposed to administration reports, the Russian buildup, which cite alleged missile installations and alleged numbers of Russian troops in Cuba, one must assume that other Members of Congress have been offered not only pictures but countless allegations, as well, by the Cuban refugees, their political organs, and their publicity organs.

I am very much concerned about the practice of the CIA of giving financial subsidies to these organizations and publications. It raises the suspicion that they can be used by the Agency to whip up and inflame American opinion and, in effect, to influence the making of policy on Cuba in a way that the CIA is not permitted to do directly. It raises the suspicion that the taxpayers' money is being used to promote a particular policy favored by the Agency, one which may not be in keeping with or may even be contrary to that of the administration.

The CIA's relationship with the exiled groups points again, in my opinion, to the need for congressional supervision of the Agency.

Therefore, Mr. President, today I serve notice that I plan to answer to Mr. Allen Dulles magazine article of recent date in which he seeks to support the thesis that the CIA should not be subject to a watchdog congressional committee. Again I state—as I have stated for years in the Senate—that the CIA should be brought under congressional control, for the simple reason that in democratic America no agency should be given police-state powers. In effect, the CIA exercises police-state powers. They should be taken away from it, and the Democratic administration should take them away from it.

Later this week or next week I shall support that thesis by a rather detailed presentation of some CIA policies which I do not believe are in the interest of maintaining peace in the world. The CIA seeks to justify them on the ground that if one is going to beat Russia, Russian methods must be used. Mr.

President, we hear this argument—"The end justifies the means"—used by too many Government agencies, State and national. In my judgment, such an argument endangers very precious principles of freedom. I cannot reconcile some of the activities of the CIA with the maintenance of precious rights of freedom to the American people. Such secrecy should be stopped.

The little experience I have recently had in connection with the pictures which were offered to me bears out my point. Apparently when a magazine or a newspaper such as Bohemia Libre offers to a Senator information which deals with the foreign policy of the United States, one cannot be sure but what it is being offered with the approval of CIA.

AMERICAN-ISRAEL RELATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech on American-Israel relations, delivered in New York City on February 10 by one of the great living Americans, Ambassador Philip M. Klutznick. For the past 2 years Mr. Klutznick has very effectively served our Government as U.S. representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Recently he resigned. I am satisfied that he resigned for two compelling reasons: One, health; the other, to take care of his personal business affairs.

In making this request, I wish to say that in the wonderful speech on American-Israel relations which he made in New York City on February 10, he has left with us an account of his views on that subject which I think every Member of Congress should read. His speech is an excellent one; and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN-ISRAEL RELATIONS

(By Philip M. Klutznick to B'nai Zion, New York City, February 10, 1963)

At your annual dinner a few years ago, you honored a Senator who later became President of the United States. He discussed American-Israel relationships in positive and candid terms. He amplified these views during the campaign for the presidency in a brilliant and constructive address in August 1960. In it he set some difficult and challenging goals for himself. In my 2 years of intimate concern with events inside the administration affecting American-Israel relationships, I found no gap between President Kennedy's views as he stated them earlier and his earnest and dedicated performance as our Nation's Chief Executive.

As a consequence, I am saddened by rumors attending my recent resignation. In the English Jewish press in Canada, the United Kingdom, and Israel, and through some editorial comment in the United States, it was suggested that the real cause of my resignation was my alleged dissatisfaction with the administration's attitude toward Israel. Such rumors are complete and unfounded nonsense. In a matter so vital, I would not play fast and loose with either the administration or the Jewish community. In spite of problems that have arisen and may again arise, I am proud to have been as-

sociated officially with the administration. I am convinced that President Kennedy is performing in the best interests of the United States and in keeping with a positive, progressive, and constructive policy in American-Israel relationships.

I appreciate fully your desire to do me honor. The devotion of B'nai Zion to the Jewish National Fund I have shared since boyhood. My mind goes back to the days when in countless Jewish homes the only positive symbol of hope for the realization of the dream of centuries was the little blue box—the pushka of the JNF. It is for this and reasons of long friendship that I am honored to be here tonight. I knew when your committee called on me that I would be leaving the Government service at the end of 1962. I felt that I would want to make public expression on American-Israel relationships. This was the platform from which our President chose, while he was a Senator, to clarify his views on the subject. It certainly is an appropriate place for an American, who is a Jew, to do likewise. This is especially true after 2 years in which diplomatic propriety demanded a high measure of public silence.

Let there be no illusions about my official role. My duties as a U.S. Ambassador in the United Nations concerned economic, social, and financial matters. The politically surcharged item of American-Israel relations was never assigned to me either at the Permanent Mission or during General Assembly sessions. Whatever I did in that regard was informal either at the request of my superiors or at my own suggestion. But, I was always guided by the proprieties of relationship within a government.

It has been an edifying experience for me to watch the American-Jewish community for the first time in years from a relatively detached vantage point. No less interesting has been the opportunity to observe the performance of Israel and its diplomatic corps at close quarters and in its natural habitat where we met as fellow diplomats each with unalloyed commitment to serve different though friendly countries.

It is my conclusion that the State of Israel and its personnel have matured and grown rapidly both in their understanding and in their performance in the international arena. On the other hand, the American-Jewish community seems to be floundering. We are still trying to understand our own role within this our own country and in our relationship to Israel and other Jewish communities of the world. This is not a criticism. It is a sincere observation made in good faith out of the hope that we can do something about it.

This is an enormous reaction in our Jewish community when incidents involved in American-Israel relationships arise. Therefore, trying to anticipate and to understand this relationship may be the very key to an accelerated maturity as well as a more effective role for the American-Jewish community. For all problems are by no means solved.

By now, we know that regional tensions like those in the Middle East are more difficult, if not impossible, of solution, so long as the struggle between the West and the East is unresolved or unstabilized. There is just too much room for competition for temporary favors sought and granted by competing sides to permit solid and lasting solutions.

We are living in an unusual epoch. Big powers possess the greatest and most destructive military strength in history. But it remains virtually immobilized while big powers compete for the friendship of small, weak, and poor nations. The meek have truly inherited the earth. Any sane and reasonable attitude toward American-Israel relationships must reflect intelligently on

February 18

this reality. Whether we approve of certain relationships or not, it must be expected that our Nation, in its own national interest, will maintain friendly and helpful contacts with many nations, including not only Israel but Arab, African, Latin American and Asian states which appear to merit such consideration. The peace of the world requires it.

Another aspect is self-evident but bears repetition. On many issues, Israel aligns herself with the West (she has one of the best, if not the best, records of voting on the same side as the United States in the United Nations among nontreaty states). Yet Israel is sovereign and as such acts as she should in what she considers her own best interest. It is no less true of our own Nation. Israel is not a satellite of the United States or of the West; nor is the United States a satellite of Israel. Both Nations are blessed with able, intelligent and energetic leadership. Where energy, intelligence and movement are present, possibilities for occasional differences arise even while the fundamental relationship is sound and friendly.

Then again, the United States maintains relationships with many friendly nations, some of which are unfriendly to one another. The Israel-Arab situation is not unique. The United States is friendly to both Pakistan and India. Has this solved the Kashmir bitterness? The United States did its best to help set at rest the West Irish conflict between the Netherlands and Indonesia. During the process, Indonesia moved closer to the Soviet and the Dutch publicly berated us at home. Or one might ponder on the discomfort of trying to be a constructive friend to Portugal and to South Africa while trying to maintain the United States' historic belief in the self-determination of peoples. This has not made life with either Portugal or South Africa or, for that matter, with some of the new African nations, a bed of roses. Need one make the point more effectively than to note the occasions when the United States found itself at odds with its oldest ally, France, including the startling events of recent days, and with its close and old ally, the United Kingdom. In an overwrought, exceedingly tense and fluid world, we must expect momentary incongruities. These are usually passing phases with little impact on long-term interests and more profound mutualities.

The closest of friends among the nations of the world go through periods of disagreement, and foes find moments of agreement. Consequently there is always the possibility that differences can arise between the Governments of the United States and Israel. When in the judgment of the governments of states that are friendly national interests conflict, it is not tragic so long as basic and fundamental relationships remain sound.

It is dangerous to elect the role of a prophet but our people have a tradition that encourages the Jew to try prophecy. There are several areas that in the future could bring about momentary or ephemeral differences between the United States and the State of Israel even with as friendly and understanding an administration as that headed by President Kennedy. I would hope that this will not happen but in today's world, anything can happen. Let us examine a few possibilities for a moment.

1. This administration believes deeply in the right and the duty of a state to defend itself from actual or threatened aggression. The recent most classic example is Cuba. At times in the past, and possibly in the future, there have been different approaches to this question by the United States and by Israel. Our Government has held that a member of the United Nations should exhaust the opportunities which that organization affords for peaceful settlement before actually shooting at the other side or shooting back

in retaliation. Even in the case of Cuba, the United States took steps short of gunfire when its whole existence was threatened until the Organization of American States and the Security Council of the United Nations examined the problem.

Israel has openly expressed doubt that it can rely on the Security Council to protect it against Arab States. She has felt, not without some cause, that the Soviet veto is always available so long as the Soviet-Arab flirtation continues. Our country has felt that anticipating a veto does not justify refusing to present a case before retaliation.

It is my estimate that currently there is a better understanding on this question between the United States and Israel. Hopefully, this, with all of its implied risks, might avoid the kind of misunderstanding in the Jewish community that arose in the spring of 1962 when the Security Council censured Israel. But if Israel honestly fears its chances in the Security Council and therefore avoids initiating Security Council processes when attacked, there is the danger of a repetition of the unhappy events of last year. If this should happen, the important thing will be to determine whether it actually affects the long-term friendly relations between the two countries or is only an unfortunate, but nevertheless passing phase.

2. Let us take a calm but brief look at the Arab refugee problem. The United States and Israel would both like to see this problem solved. Both countries are generally moved by humanitarianism. But sovereign states cannot afford generosity if other vital interests are seriously and adversely affected. Israel properly fears for its security in the event of large scale repatriation. The sine qua non of sovereignty is the security of a nation's people. I am completely sanguine that the Kennedy administration would never deliberately and consciously encourage a plan which would endanger the security of Israel, no matter how urgent it regards the desirability of an Arab refugee solution. Yet, it is inconceivable that the Congress will continue to make substantial appropriations for UNWRA much longer without evidence that a solution is being actively sought or is on the horizon. It seems patent that both countries agree completely on three things:

- (a) it is politically desirable that the problem be solved;
- (b) a solution must not adversely affect the security of Israel; and
- (c) that simple humanitarianism demands that the problem be solved.

But there can be differences dictated by differing exposures and accountabilities of the governments involved. These differences, if they arise, can only yield to patient and painstaking negotiation between the governments involved. The substitute of polemics will only complicate, not clarify.

Recent events tend to negate the prospect of a serious split on this issue. On a particular amendment in the General Assembly, the United States and Israel stood alone in voting against it. The reasons differed, but the fact created much comment in the halls of the United Nations. The debate in the 17th General Assembly and the voting pattern suggest that maybe basic and overt differences can be avoided. Nevertheless, I am convinced that, in keeping with his public pledges, the President and this administration will try for achievable solutions but with sincere and intelligent regard for Israel's security as well as the welfare of the refugees.

3. In another area of potential static assistance to states not friendly to Israel—I feel more at home as a result of my recent work. One of the oldest foreign aid debates is whether a donor state should disburse aid to states unless they are allied with it formally and informally. This ques-

tion loses some of its ateam if foreign aid is approached from a moral point of view. The United States is the richest and most powerful Nation in the world. Like a rich and powerful individual, it has some responsibility to those less fortunate. How and to what extent it discharges this is within its own control. But, if it acts for selfish reasons alone, the decisions may be self-defeating. Just like philanthropy distributed for self-aggrandisement loses its flavor, so foreign aid used to buy friendships rarely succeeds.

On the other hand, one must candidly recognize that if foreign aid strengthens a country, such added strength can be used for better or for worse. A nation sincerely trying to develop economically has little time and less resource for military adventure. Self-defense is all it can afford at best. Some states have not yet learned this truth.

I believe that the hope for peace in the world depends on the elevation of the economic and social standards of many peoples. This is a fundamental objective of the United Nations Charter. It has symbolized the policy of the United States in this post-war era. It can be honestly argued whether aid extended to certain Arab States will blunt the edge of their antagonisms toward Israel or feed the flame of their hostility. But it cannot be disputed that the presence of a constructive U.S. influence should tend to lessen potential troubles.

This is a disturbing problem. When a state that proclaims belligerence and threatens hostilities against a neighbor is provided food and credits, it is reasonable to assume that it is strengthened to commit war even though the aid itself is directed to other channels. A historic analysis of such situations will demonstrate that there are risks in either aiding or withholding aid in a dangerous world. On the balance, the odds should favor establishing a constructive U.S. influence if possible and in elevating the economic and social level of the people themselves. It is foolhardy to do so recklessly without careful and rational examination accompanied by constant review.

So long as the United States is in the position of making choices and decisions that could affect the cause of peace and the interests of the free world, questions will continue to arise as to whether our policy at a given moment promotes the easing or heightening of tensions in the Middle East. We must be careful to relate what happens to policy objectives, to the degree of caution that is exercised and to the frequency of the review of potentialities. Perhaps, under such circumstances, any open split involving friends of Israel will be averted.

But actually, it is not these dramatic and isolated issues that provide the basic tests of American-Israel relations any more than they do of U.S. relations with many friends. The real tests rest on far more fundamental matters than votes in the United Nations or whether a little more or a little less aid should or should not have been given to a country not friendly to Israel or whether solutions for the Arab refugee problem should be sought in one way or another openly or clandestinely. The real question is will a great power help a relatively new and struggling small state to maintain its independence and its sovereignty if its security is endangered and will it help that state overcome an adverse economic balance so it can escape national poverty.

In these matters of real life or death I speak with complete conviction. The independence and security of Israel are an element of the U.S. foreign policy. This is not a new policy. But in recent months it passed the acid test. The United States has never provided major arms assistance to the State of Israel. Other countries have done

UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP					
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS			DATE	INITIALS
1	DCI & DDCI				
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT		FILE		RETURN	
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE	
<p>Remarks: Attached is an extract from the <u>Congressional Record</u> of 18 February containing statements made by Senator Morse against the Agency in connection with the recent <u>Daily News</u> article. As indicated, Senator Morse has stated he plans to have much more to say on this subject.</p>					
<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 200px; height: 20px; margin: 0 auto;"></div> <p>Assistant Legislative Counsel</p>					
cc: DCI, DDCI					
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER					
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.					DATE
<p>Approved For Release 2004/06/23 : CIA-RDP65B00383R000200230052-0</p>					
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	

STAT

House of Representatives

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I John 4: 21: *This commandment have we from Him, that he who loveth God must love his brother also.*

Almighty and ever-blessed God, grant that in this Brotherhood Week we may have a clear vision of the high and helpful things which we may do together for the health and happiness of all mankind.

Make us humbly grateful for the many opportunities that are continually coming to us to speak a word of good cheer and to extend a hand of helpfulness to the needy members of the human family.

May we realize more fully that the question "Am I my brother's keeper?" must be answered conclusively in the affirmative.

Enable us to go in and out among our fellow men as the heralds of a new day when men and nations shall live as brothers on the high levels of peace and good will.

Help us to practice the Golden Rule and inspire us with those finer thoughts and feelings that are the progenitors of achievement in the building of a nobler civilization.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 14, 1963, was read and approved.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, February 21, 1963, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to today, the Chair designates the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the approval of the Journal on February 21, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today and also on February 19, 25, and 26.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, one of the somber monuments of the Hitler-Stalin era is the continued occupation of ancient free nations by foreign systems. The Lithuanian Republic is still occupied and controlled by the Soviet Union. It is the victim of a period in human history when small nations were exchanged like pawns in the savage confrontation between the Nazi and Soviet warlords.

The Soviet army marched into Lithuania in 1939 after the Hitler-Stalin Pact had given the Nazi war machine a free hand in Western Europe and Hitler paid the price by agreeing that Stalin could occupy the Baltic Republics.

The fighting of the war that followed is long since ended, but the Soviet occupation of Lithuania continues. The people of Lithuania deserve something better. They deserve the moral support that we can give them by recognizing their contributions to freedom and their honorable history.

In this country, tens of thousands of Americans of Lithuanian descent celebrated this month the anniversary of a better day—the day in 1918, February 16, when the people of their fatherland proclaimed their independence of both old imperial Germany and revolutionary Russia.

They set up a republic. They organized their society as a free people. They asserted their right to live free of foreign aggression from whatever source.

In the brief decade Lithuania had, it established its place in the forefront of progressive democratic societies. It pushed an educational program that cut the rate of illiteracy from two-thirds of the people to less than 15 percent. The Lithuanian Republic adopted the first land-reform law of modern Europe.

All of this was built upon a cultural and national tradition that goes back to the 13th century. It was created by people who welcomed the chance to spend their energies in proving their right to an independent place in the world.

The land of the Lithuanians is occupied by the Soviets, but we have a right to doubt that the spirit of the people is conquered.

The U.S. Government has quite properly declined to recognize the legality of the Soviet seizure of power in Lithuania.

It has never accepted the attempted liquidation of the Republic. At the time when in their hearts there is a silent celebration of their 1918 Independence Day, it is proper for us to wish the people of Lithuania well, to assure them that they are not forgotten.

UNITED NATIONS FUNDS TO CUBA

(Mr. FUQUA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, one of the continuing international problems which faces the Congress and all of the American people is that of Cuba. Here we find a Communist government only 90 miles off the coast of Florida, actively supported by troops of the Soviet Union.

It seems to me that this Nation cannot rest as long as Castro and his kind remain in power in our hemisphere. The subversive activities of his government to the other Latin American nations poses more of a threat than that of the weapons and Soviet troops that remain in Cuba.

I supported the President's firm action in having the missiles and missile bases removed from Cuba, and I believe this Nation must have just as firm a policy in dealing with this Communist dictatorship to insure its eventual overthrow.

As a Member of the Congress, an action by the United Nations last week shocked me. We find that the United Nations Special Fund has approved a 6-month test plan for Cuban crop diversification. I wrote U.N. Ambassador Stevenson a vigorous denunciation of this act which I consider an insult to the United States.

The program calls for a reported \$100,000 to be spent by the U.N. in this test program, and if successful, to be extended for 5 years with the U.N. share of the eventual cost to be \$1.2 million.

The remarks of Paul G. Hoffman, American manager director of the Fund, that no American funds would be used in this project is ridiculous on the face of it. We have, in this Nation, attempted to keep the United Nations a forum for world discussion, paying a far heavier than proportionable share of the United Nations operating expenses, and then find this organization giving aid to the Communist menace only 90 miles off our shore.

I called on Ambassador Stevenson for an explanation, pointing out that we find our country in the position of giving funds on one hand, to be used by our sworn and mortal enemy on the other.

I regard this action of the U.N. an insult to the United States and have vigorously expressed my indignation.

To my mind the problem of Cuba is the No. 1 foreign policy problem which faces this Nation. It cannot be swept under a rug. It cannot be hidden. Only strong and forceful leadership will enable us to blot out this menace to our Nation and the free world's security, and for my part, I pledge my every effort to hasten the day when Castro will be defeated and a truly free Cuba restored.

COMMUNIST THREATS TO THE SECURITY OF THIS HEMISPHERE

(Mr. MATTHEWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, today the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs opens its hearings into the vital matter of Communist threats to the security of this hemisphere.

In this regard, I wish to call the attention of the House to an article by Mr. James Free, of the Washington Bureau of the Birmingham, Ala. News.

Mr. Free points out the qualifications and extensive experience of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs to conduct these investigations in the interests of our Nation and our hemisphere.

Mr. Free's article follows:

SELDEN AND STENNIS CALLED GOOD BETS TO GET FACTS ON CUBA

(By James Free)

WASHINGTON, February 12.—Strictly down-the-middle probes of the Russian buildup in Cuba can be expected from both subcommittees of Congress that will buckle down to the task after the lull this week for Lincoln's birthday.

The two chairmen, Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, Democrat of Mississippi, and Representative ARMISTEAD SELDEN, Democrat of Alabama, are conservative Southerners with no close administration ties.

While they will not hesitate to bring out facts embarrassing to the Kennedy administration, neither will they have any compunction about making a report that might pull the rug out from under Republican charges against the administration.

Moreover, between the two investigating groups, the American people should be able to get a comprehensive picture of Russia's strength in Cuba and the extent of the threat to this hemisphere.

STENNIS' Preparedness Subcommittee will center its attention on military aspects, with subversion and related dangers being secondary but significant matters of concern.

SELDEN's Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee will stress the extent of the Communist subversion threat from Cuba to Latin America on a country-by-country basis. Comparative military power will be considered only as it pertains to the ability of various countries to resist subversion.

Both STENNIS and SELDEN will inquire into present long-range U.S. policy regarding Soviet military bases and forces in Cuba or elsewhere in the Americas. Here, again, emphasis of the Senate subcommittee will be on defense policy, while concern of the House foreign affairs group will be on diplomatic policy.

Beyond question, there will be some duplication in the information brought out by the two investigating subcommittees. But this should help assure a balanced perspective and provide more varied sources of information.

STENNIS' handling of hot past probes—the muzzling-the-military hearings last year,

for example—has won him a reputation as a steady, impartial, and cool man with a gavel. His early years as a circuit judge show through clearly.

SELDEN has yet to prove his mettle in highly publicized hearings. But House colleagues point to his early and largely ignored warnings on Cuba, first to the Eisenhower administration and later to the Kennedy administration. They note his leadership in prodding the Organization of American States into taking action against Castrolism. Neither chairman is given to sensationalism. Both have been dissatisfied with the Kennedy administration tendency to rate the Soviet buildup mainly in terms of "offensive" or "defensive" weapons.

SELDEN and STENNIS, as well, have had fully as much information about Russian troops and weapons in Cuba as have had the Republicans who publicly charged the administration with sugar-coating the story.

Neither chairman has remained silent on Cuba, but any comment has been restrained. Back on December 16, for example, SELDEN told this reporter there were "at least 15,000" Soviet troops in Cuba. This was some time before the administration admitted this officially.

SELDEN's subcommittee will conduct 3 days of hearings starting February 18. Two comparable periods of testimony will be scheduled later.

STENNIS' subcommittee so far has heard only one witness: John A. McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, in closed session. But other witnesses will testify starting probably week after next. And several weeks of additional hearings are in prospect.

THE FALLACY OF TOO MUCH PLANNING

(Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, some time back a large audience heard an acknowledged eloquent speaker say:

I do not believe that Washington should do for the people what they can do for themselves through local and private effort. There is no magic attached to tax dollars that have been to Washington and back.

These words have a ring of truth. They are a simple statement of fact, and are quoted from a speech made before the Associated Business Publications Conference, held at the Biltmore Hotel in New York City, on October 12, 1960.

They were made in connection with a discussion of American economic policy, and underscored a plea for a strong economy in our country, thus "not only to sustain our defenses, but also to demonstrate to other nations, particularly those wavering between our system and the Communists—that the way of freedom is the way to strength and security—that their future lies with us and not with the Soviet Union."

That portion of the speech I have just quoted ends with this statement:

That is the basic issue of 1960—and that is why each candidate must make clear his views on economic policy.

Now, lest some who read this immediately assume the speaker was one of those labeled as "reactionary"—of whom it has been said "he has one eye ahead and one eye on the rearview mirror"—let me identify the eloquent speaker

whose words opened and have been quoted in this statement of mine. It was Senator John Fitzgerald Kennedy, running for the highest office in the land, the Presidency.

Since Senator Kennedy succeeded in his ardent desire to become President, the Congress has received well over 60 messages—not one of which failed to request, or was accompanied by, proposed legislation which would result in Washington doing for the people what they should do for themselves, through local and private effort, with the exception, of course, of provision for our national defense.

It would be easy—and the temptation is great—to protect some of the illusions cherished by a portion of the American people, and lay at the door of the much-berated Presidential advisers, or even brother Bobby, the blame for many of these requests for legislation. However, the facts are that these messages to the Congress came directly from the President, were signed by him with his full knowledge of their content and implication, and he further has aggressively and consistently pressed for enactment of a major portion of these proposals.

All these legislative proposals were presumably geared to the President's repeatedly expressed wish to "move America ahead." And we all know now that without the Congress enacting even a smidgin of these proposals, we have indeed moved ahead—rapidly and inexorably—to the fantastic planned budget expenditures of \$98,802 million for 1964—to the increase by 135,510 in Federal personnel since the change in administration in 1961—to the planned deficit of \$11,902 million for 1964—and thence to an estimated national debt of \$315,604 million which will extend much further than 1964. And all this without a determination and inclusion of the actual total cost of additional Federal aid to education, additional Federal medical care for the aged, additional Federal assistance to urban areas, or even a successful trip to the moon.

We have also moved ahead—rapidly and inexorably—to the final culmination and humiliation of a Communist regime only 90 miles from our southeastern Atlantic coast. Not only is this Communist government completely equipped by the Soviet Union with arms and troops, supposedly for self-defense, but it likewise possesses the additional bonus of our diplomatic guarantee against invasion. This is now crowned by the promise of United Nations aid to agriculture for this Communist nation—indirectly financed by our own funds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like permission to revise and extend my remarks and include with them an article written by Henry Hazlitt, entitled "The Fallacy of Too Much Planning," which appeared in the Reader's Digest of February 1963 as a condensed version of the original article in Newsweek of September 24, 1962. This article expresses some well-known truths, which we as a Nation should be willing to face, lest we find ourselves—God forbid—at the point of no return:

The U.S. Senate has passed several pieces of legislation favorable to migrants; now it is time for the House to do something about an intolerable situation.

Let me express one more thought. The exploitation of migrant labor in American agriculture may seem utterly foreign to us. Most of us are not farmworkers; we live in cities; we know that American industry is powerful. Both labor and management are organized; we are a mighty Nation. Wandering farmworkers seem far away.

But, we must not forget that freedom is indivisible; human rights belong to all. If one large segment of our economy practices tyranny, America is weakened. If we permit human rights to be denied anywhere, they are in jeopardy everywhere. When the rights of minorities are violated, the very idea of freedom and justice is damaged. The atrocities perpetrated against migrants have been the responsibility and the tragedy of all of us.

Our treatment of the migrants in recent years has been unworthy of us as a free people; it has been a national disgrace. Not all farmers are to be blamed; not all growers are dishonest; but the system itself has been wrong. All too often braceros and citizen migrants have been treated shamefully. Now, at long last, public opinion rises up to condemn these iniquities which have hurt our good name around the world, particularly in Latin America.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. HRUSKA obtained the floor.

Mr. CLARK rose.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his courtesy.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Humphrey) is presently in Geneva, Switzerland, attending as a congressional observer the proceedings at the Disarmament Conference. I commend him for his interest in this subject and in the negotiation of a test ban treaty, and hope that as a result of his visit there he will be able to report progress when he returns to the Senate next week.

The Senator from Minnesota has been much interested, as many of us have been, in the impending visit of President Romulo Betancourt, of Venezuela, to our country. At the request of the Senator from Minnesota, I ask unanimous consent that a statement he would have made to the Senate with respect to the visit by President Betancourt, to which are attached a number of exhibits, may be printed in the Record at this point, with the attachments to the statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
Today we welcome to Washington one of the great statesmen of this hemisphere, President Romulo Betancourt, of Venezuela.

The government of President Betancourt has become the No. 1 target of Communist attack in Latin America. Operating from

Castro's Cuba, the Communists have unleashed a continual torrent on intimidation, violence, and terror against Venezuela. The recent burning of the Sears, Roebuck warehouse, the sabotage of the Maracay oil refineries, and the pirating of the ship are all a part of this pattern of violence and subversion.

Venezuela is the No. 1 target because the Alliance for Progress is succeeding there. It is the No. 1 target because the subversion of Venezuela with its huge resource of oil and iron would provide a springboard for the penetration of the entire South American Continent. It would convert the Caribbean into a Communist sea.

The U.S. Government must make it clear to all that an attack on Venezuela will not be permitted to succeed. It will be repelled, regardless of cost. The Betancourt government has made progress despite continuing political attacks from the extreme left and the economic harassment from the extreme right. With the help of the United States it will survive the current external Communist attack and continue to represent a beacon of democracy in a troubled Caribbean.

The government of President Betancourt in Venezuela is a progressive government. It is open and friendly to the United States and vigorously supports us in all international councils. It respects private property, private capital, and investment. It encourages capital investment. And at the same time it sponsors the broadest social reforms and developments for its people. It has strong trade unions, rural cooperatives, and all the things we know about in this country. It is a government that is acting boldly in the fields of housing, health, education, and rural development. The Communists are determined to destroy the Betancourt government because they know that if constitutional democracy succeeds in Venezuela, communism in Latin America will have suffered a disastrous defeat. President Betancourt is one of the great leaders of our hemisphere, and no man has done more to insure the success of the Alliance for Progress.

I recently had the great pleasure of visiting Venezuela and of discussing, meeting with President Betancourt and leaders of his government, and of viewing the Alliance for Progress in action. President Betancourt started his own Alliance for Progress type program of economic development and social reform when his government was inaugurated in February of 1959. The political harassments have been largely overcome thanks to President Betancourt's courage and astuteness. Though the economic harassments have been more unyielding, progress has been made in recent months in improving the pace of business activity.

The government expenditures for education have tripled, reaching the level in 1962 of \$231 million. This is 15 percent of the total national budget, the level which the Punta del Este Conference recommended be achieved by 1970. The number of students in elementary schools has almost doubled, increasing from 600,000 to 1,100,000. Under the Venezuelan agrarian reform program, 55,000 campesinos have received their own plots of land. Rural housing and a community development program are underway, and an attack has been started on the problems of eradicating Caracas' enormous slums.

During my visit to Caracas I was privileged to be present for the signing of the \$30 million AID loan agreement which will be used for housing and community development facilities in Venezuela. The Betancourt government has developed one of the continent's best health programs. The ministry of health now has a budget of over \$100 million a year. It has 19,000 employees, many of whom serve in the network of rural health centers. The magnitude of this program is appreciated when we recall that

Venezuela has only 7 million inhabitants. The health program of the Betancourt government has been so successful that accidents are now the greatest cause of death in the 5 to 45 age group.

Although the U.S. Government has given substantial assistance to Venezuela during the past 2 years, most of the above has been accomplished by Venezuelans using Venezuelan resources.

A further reason for the cordial relations currently maintained between the United States and Venezuela is the caliber of our representation there. We have in Ambassador C. Allen Stewart one of the top ambassadors in all Latin America. He is a man of courage, resourcefulness, integrity, and strength. He is highly regarded by Venezuelans, by his fellow diplomats, the American community in Venezuela, and by officials of the U.S. Government who know of the job he is doing there.

Recently Ambassador Stewart discussed one of the thorniest problems facing the Alliance for Progress, that of the role of private enterprise in the Alliance. In an address to the Rotary Club of Tachira in the State of San Cristobal in January of this year he stated, "free enterprise is an essential element to the Alliance for Progress just as it is basic to the democratic system. Judiciously regulated where necessary, and complemented by government efforts where it lacks the incentive to perform, free enterprise has provided the mechanism for economic progress of the free world." In this address, entitled "Capital and Confidence: Keys to the Alliance," Ambassador Stewart then spells out the various problems confronting the American businessman in Venezuela in particular and Latin America in general. It is an excellent statement and should be read by all those interested in the partnership of free enterprise and economic progress in Latin America. I attach a copy of the address at this point in these remarks:

"CAPITAL AND CONFIDENCE: KEYS TO THE ALLIANCE"

"(Address by U.S. Ambassador C. Allen Stewart before the Rotary Club of Tachira, San Cristobal, January 22, 1963)

"My last visit to the Andes was nearly 20 years ago as a news correspondent negotiating what was then a rather challenging road from Bogotá to Caracas on reassignment. Needless to say, I am delighted to be back.

"I find on returning as a diplomat, but still with, I hope, a newspaperman's instinct for observation, that the mountains and clouds haven't changed but almost everything else has. There is a modern city where once a large town stood, a refreshing liberal attitude, and a vibrant spirit of progress that has grown with the years. There are new roads, schools, hospitals, industries. Your people are the sturdy Andinos of before, but somehow they seem to move faster and with a more purposeful gait. Tachira, I can say from personal observation, is moving ahead.

"Indeed, all Venezuela is moving ahead, under its new democracy. I seriously doubt that, now that Venezuela has experienced 4 years of progress under a free system, it will ever again tolerate the enslavements of either rightist or leftist dictatorships.

"But I have come not to compliment you but to give you my views on the most dramatic program for social and economic progress ever devised in modern times. I refer, of course, to the Alliance for Progress, an imaginative, comprehensive program involving governments as well as private enterprise, both local and foreign, in a vast co-operative effort to raise economic and social levels throughout Latin America.

"To those prophets of doom who, for reasons best known to themselves, say the Alliance for Progress cannot succeed, let me say just this: Although the Alliance is very

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE PASSING SCENE
(By William S. White)

INDEPENDENT AUDIT OF CUBA THREAT

An inquiry of enormous implications into the exact present military position in Castro Cuba is about to be opened by the Senate through one of its elite bodies. This is the Preparedness Subcommittee headed by Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, of Mississippi.

There are Senate investigations and there are Senate investigations. Some are disruptive headline safaris, inflaming public feeling and smearing honest people on the basis of "verdict first—evidence later." Some are of the finest quality: careful, fair, searching, pitiless but not petty, vigorous but not virulent.

Almost certainly, on the group's record, the investigation into Cuba to be made shortly by STENNIS' Preparedness Subcommittee will be one of these latter, a service to the highest interests of the United States and of this hemisphere.

What Senator STENNIS is interested in is to determine in behalf of the Senate, from our own military and intelligence sources and from responsible Cubans, precisely what Soviet armament remains in Cuba and precisely what capacity it may have to endanger this country or any other in the hemisphere.

No second guess

There is no purpose either to haze President Kennedy or to protect President Kennedy. There is also no purpose to second guess either the President's lack of support for the doomed patriots' invasion of Castro Cuba in the spring of 1961 or the President's strong action against the Soviet missile lodgment in Cuba in the fall of 1962.

What STENNIS and his colleagues—one of the best sets of men in the Senate and the most unpartisan when it comes to national security—most want to know is where we go from here. They are not too interested in who did what to whom in the lost yesterdays.

If they can sustain this Spartan course of sheer factfinding they will have given the whole Nation—not excluding President Kennedy himself—fresh reason to be glad that a Senate Preparedness Subcommittee exists.

For the problem as to Cuba is twofold. It is vital to have a public audit independent of that of the administration as to Castro's present offensive capabilities. But it is no less vital not to let some partisan motivated and incompetent Senate group rush into this sensitive area and trample all over the constitutional right of any President to run the foreign policy of the United States, right or wrong though his decisions may be thought to be.

Given inaction by STENNIS, just such a result probably would have followed. Given the readiness of the Stennis group to act, however, the strong probability is that because of its demonstrated competence and responsibility and restraint all hands will be satisfied to leave the matter in its hands.

A fateful verdict

And at the end, the country will have reason to rely on the findings of these good and able men—plus one woman: Senators STENNIS, STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, HENRY JACKSON, of Washington, and E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska, all Democrats, and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, MARGARET SMITH, of Maine, and BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, all Republicans.

If they find that Cuba in fact still poses an offensive threat to this country or hemisphere, they will simply say so. If they find

that Cuba in fact is no such offensive menace they will simply say so.

Thus, the verdict may be nothing less than fateful. If this verdict is that Cuba is still a seat of mortal peril to this hemisphere it will surely follow that Cuba in due time will be invaded and sanitized—not necessarily by the United States itself, but invaded and sanitized all the same. If the verdict is that Cuba is only a defensive lodgment of communism, this present slow course of trying to isolate and cut down Cuba by measures short of war will continue.

PLIGHT OF SEASONAL FARMWORKERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the most courageous leaders in the fight for a better life for one of America's most underprivileged groups, our seasonal farmworkers, has been the archbishop of San Antonio, the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey. As executive chairman of the bishops' committee for the Spanish speaking, he has long shown a deep concern for the migrant farmworkers, so many of whom are Spanish-speaking Americans. Recently his efforts and achievements received the recognition they most certainly deserve when the Houston Chapter of the American Jewish Committee bestowed on Archbishop Lucey the first annual Max Nathan Award. On that occasion, the archbishop gave a most forceful and inspiring speech on the life of the migrant laborer. I was most impressed with the archbishop's remarks and am sure that will be of interest to my colleagues in the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HIS EXCELLENCY, THE MOST REVEREND ROBERT E. LUCEY

To be the first recipient of the Max Nathan Award of the Houston chapter of the American Jewish Committee is indeed a distinct honor. I am deeply grateful to the Houston chapter for this favor and to all of you for your presence here this evening. The conferring of this award gives citizens of Texas an opportunity to break bread together in a friendly, cordial atmosphere of good will even though our religious loyalties are not identical; we are Jews and Protestants and Catholics. But we are all Americans and we are dedicated under God to the principle that all men are equal and every citizen has a right to justice and freedom.

For too long we Americans have been quarreling about religion. It seems to me that there is no legitimate place in America for that sort of controversy. This does not mean that religion should be ignored or that discussion of human destiny and eternal truth is out of place. It does mean that as intelligent citizens we ought to be able to conduct religious dialog on a high level of friendship, commonsense and consideration for the rights of others. The bestowal of this award is therefore an occasion of unity, solidarity and good will among citizens of south Texas.

In this period of history we Americans should be united. These are serious times; unnecessary controversy among ourselves is a luxury we can ill afford. Our beloved country is the last bulwark of civilization, of justice, of freedom. In the world commu-

nity there are two powerful nations which deny the dignity of man and human rights. They are bent on world conquest; they despise the American way of life; they will crush us if they can because we block their path to total, ruthless tyranny. Since these Communist governments do not believe in God they cannot believe in man because the creature has dignity only when he stands in the reflected grandeur of his Creator.

These two countries of the East have placed in jeopardy our survival as a nation. They plan to preside at our funeral; they have in mind to bury us. Our job today is to prove to ourselves and to the family of nations that we are worthy of survival. Lip-service to human rights no longer has value. The 20th century has caught up with those unworthy stewards who publicly proclaim liberty and justice for all; but privately try to massacre both liberty and justice for minority groups.

The Max Nathan Award dramatizes the problem of migrant labor in American agriculture. It points an accusing finger at the iniquities of that program; at the injustices which are a blot on our escutcheon; at a situation which I have described publicly as our badge of infamy, a ghastly international racket.

Migrants may be nationals of Mexico and they are known as braceros or they may be Texans and they are known as citizen migrants. In either case the exploitation of the migrant is almost inevitable. In the first place his position is weak. He stands before his employer defenseless and alone. He needs food and the necessities of life. He has little or no bargaining power. He must work to eat. His children need food. Until this year the employer could hire this man for 50 cents an hour and make him work 12 hours a day, 7 days a week, picking cotton. When payday came, the grower could reduce the wage to 30 cents an hour and if the worker didn't like it that was too bad for him. If he happened to be a Mexican national he could be sent home as a troublemaker. Prudence dictated that he be docile, silent, and robbed.

Another reason why the exploitation of migrant workers is almost inevitable is the absence of protective legislation. Much helpful social legislation has been enacted in our country but farm labor has been specifically exempted from most of it. Agriculture is a sacred cow. Certain farm organizations have made it so. Most of the attempts to better the condition of farm labor have been beaten down. Even child labor has been encouraged.

I think it's about time for reactionary growers to join the human race, shows signs of being civilized, and begin to behave like decent Americans. There is nothing particularly sacred about agriculture. The growers are not spacemen from another planet exempt from all laws of honesty and decency; they are not little Caesars possessed of special exemptions and immunities; their business is not a segment of our economy separate and distinct from the stream of American life. American agriculture is not a sick industry; it is very strong.

It is only certain growers who are over-stuffed with pride and power. They can pay good wages and make a fair profit if they want to.

By the same token farmworkers are not second-class citizens nor are they less than human. We owe it to them to give them a chance to lead their lives in decent and frugal comfort. There is no reason in logic or morality why the good name of our country should be dragged in the gutter of disrepute to satisfy the greed and rapacity of evil men. We ought to protect the migrant by legislation until he is strong enough to protect himself.

young, it already is nurturing hope where there was despair. The challenges have been recognized, and the nations of this hemisphere have committed themselves to an all-out cooperative effort to meet them.

"And further, the cause is right. The nations of Latin America, with basic programs of planning and financing, are capable of providing their people economic satisfaction without denying political liberty. It is a job that has to be done if Latin America's masses are to share freely in the progress of the 20th century. It has been done in the United States and Western Europe, and we are confident it can be done also in Latin America once the needed resources and ingenuity of each of us are committed to the task.

"A new year's letter I received the other day from former Ambassador Teodoro Moscoso, now U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, states the case eloquently. Let me share with you a pertinent paragraph:

"I think the evidence is clear that the Alliance is moving. The schools and homes, the water systems and roads that are being built, the intense arguments among Latin Americans and between them and us about how best to carry out our charter principles, the mounting defamations of the program by those who see it as a threat to their interests—all this means that we are moving. The rate of Alliance progress depends primarily on the degree of political support of the local leaders and the sense of personal involvement of the people in each Latin American nation.

"I put great stock in Ambassador Moscoso's evaluation that the Alliance for Progress is on the move.

"But success is not automatic. The challenge is formidable. Success will require patient understanding, imagination, discipline, and a willingness by nations and individuals to study and change outmoded social structures. The first, and greatest, task is rapidly to increase and rationalize economic production in order that more wealth will be available to satisfy the just needs of every Latin American. Any necessary reforms in land distribution, taxes, housing, education, food production, and all other social and economic areas must be investigated and any necessary reforms put into effect if the Alliance is to move ahead with the speed necessary to drastically lessen, in our time, the miseria which has plagued not only Latin America but most of the world since time immemorial.

"The only certainty of the alternative courses of the extreme left or right is that those systems will deny liberty to both individuals and nations. Whether they can even offer sustained economic advance is in serious question. Nowhere, for instance, have they solved the problem of providing adequate agricultural production.

"There still remain certain misconceptions about the Alliance. It must be made clear, for example, that the Alliance is not a U.S. program. True, it was proposed by President Kennedy in his inaugural address. But it was put into motion by the free vote of hemispheric nations gathered together at Punta del Este. The hemisphere accepted it as a 10-year self-help effort requiring the full participation of nations and individuals, private enterprise as well as public. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, in fact, on his recent visit to Venezuela, estimated that the United States cannot be expected to contribute more than 7 percent or so of the total funds needed in Venezuela.

"These funds are and will be in the form of low interest long-term loans which will be repaid. Thus Venezuela will finance, ultimately, its own development.

"The United States is ready and willing to do its full share, but it cannot be expected to finance more than a fraction of what of

necessity must in many cases be a vast increase in economic productivity as well as a major overhaul of parts of each country's economic and social structure. The success or failure of the Alliance for Progress depends on Latin America itself.

"Free enterprise is an essential element to the Alliance for Progress, just as it is basic to the democratic system. Judiciously regulated where necessary, and complemented by government efforts where it lacks the incentive to perform, free enterprise has provided the dynamism for the economic progress of the free world.

"There is much fuzzy thinking about capitalism and free enterprise. Not long ago in an Asian university students were asked what ideas, good or bad, they associated with various countries. When it came to the United States, a number of them commented admiringly on U.S. industrial and agricultural production and technological progress. At the same time, a good number of the same students said they did not approve of capitalism—the economic system that produced the very things they admired. Perhaps they were not even aware of the contradiction. These students admired the fruits of capitalism and free enterprise, but, for a vague and obscure reason they could not explain clearly, were opposed to the system that made these products available at a price within the reach of the consumer.

"Marx once said capitalism could only lead to the enslavement of the workers. But the workers in capitalist countries know greater liberty and economic and social welfare than ever existed in the world before, while the workers under the system spawned by Marx have become enslaved.

"Let us turn for a moment to foreign investment, a key factor in the Venezuelan economy; about 60 percent of all Venezuelan Government income is derived from industries developed with foreign capital.

"Most of you appreciate, I am sure, that the fantastically successful U.S. industrial complex could not have begun in the early 1800's without foreign investment—from England, France, Switzerland, Germany, and elsewhere—which went abroad seeking a fair profit. The incentive was profit, true, but the economic world moves on a pivot of profit. To those who decry excessive profits, I point out that the tax structure of a great many countries not only is an important lever but also a valuable means of financing the spectacular social programs which mark the progress of those nations which from these corporation taxes to which I refer, personal income taxes graduated on a sliding scale, in countries using the system, tend to eliminate the extremes of wealth and poverty which are at the root of social and economic unrest.

"On the whole, I would say that American business operating in Latin America has established an excellent record, especially since the end of World War II. This has been enlightened private enterprise, fully in sympathy with the worldwide revolution against the status quo and concerned with much more than profits. It is a truly revolutionary force which has concerned itself with economic improvement and social growth in Latin America, the basic aims of the Alliance for Progress. There is no doubt that private enterprise must play a central role in insuring the success of the program.

"U.S. investment in Latin America has easily tripled since World War II. Around \$10 billion is now staked in Latin America. This investment has increased the national product and incomes of the countries where it has located. It has created jobs, brought social advancement, and has proved a large source of revenue for host governments.

"For example, nearly 20 percent of all revenues collected by Latin American governments come from taxes on U.S. private companies operating in these countries. Such

tax payments amount to twice the profits remitted by these companies.

"The U.S. businessman has brought to Latin America the risk capital essential for the development of much of the area's great natural resources and basic industries. He has entered into hundreds of joint ventures with local capital. He has helped train unskilled workers into an efficient industrial force. He has sent Latin Americans to the United States for management training, and he has gradually filled an increasing number of key positions in his industrial and business organizations with nationals of the host country. For example, of the eight local directors of Creole four are Venezuelans. Furthermore, U.S. firms has established excellent records with respect to improvement of salaries, social benefits, safety precautions, and working conditions in general.

"Using the tools, technology, and modern work methods provided directly by U.S. private capital and free enterprise, millions of Latin Americans have had their lives dramatically changed for the better. This is a big part of the Alliance for Progress.

"When you think of U.S. foreign investment in Venezuela you immediately think of petroleum. But U.S. private industry has come into Venezuela in many other fields of endeavor, and most times in partnership with Venezuelan capital. It has gone into automobile assembly plants, food processing and packaging, textiles, banking, insurance, paper, tires, cosmetics, tobacco, and many others. And furthermore, a good many U.S. investors went into business here at the trough of an economic slump, a factor which in itself reflects confidence.

"It has been alleged that the wealthy class in many countries of Latin America tends to hold a great deal of their capital abroad rather than invest it in their own country. No doubt there is a degree of truth in this, more in some countries than in others. By its very nature private investment gravitates toward where it is offered the most attractive returns and greatest security. The amount of capital held abroad will vary according to what the people of the country themselves consider to be the political and economic prospects for their country, as well as with their dedication and loyalty. During the early days of the present Venezuelan administration there were many who lacked confidence. Confidence increases with progress, however, and certainly in the case of Venezuela so-called flight capital has been returning, thus stimulating further progress.

"Part of the capital which left Venezuela during 1959 and 1960 were the deposits which many foreign companies operating in Venezuela had in Venezuelan banks. These companies not only removed their deposits but began using local credit for operating expenses that had previously been financed from their own funds. Now that Venezuelan capital is beginning to return, it is hoped that foreign companies will reassert their confidence by making more funds available to their Venezuelan branches for plant expansion and increased activity.

"I might add in this connection that private U.S. investment cannot be expected to plunge in to fill a void created by the flight of local capital. It is only realistic to state that Venezuelan private capital must continue to return and prove its own confidence. As local confidence is increased, I see no real limit to the amount of private U.S. capital that might come to work with Venezuelan capital, in the light of every prospect for political and economic stability.

"Our two Governments already have a number of cooperative programs underway as part of the Alliance. These are in housing, water supply, agriculture, industrial development, education, public administration, and other important fields. I would like to mention just a few.

"The Alliance is helping both private and public construction organizations to solve Venezuela's housing problem. Some Bs4 million have been lent from the Inter-American Development Bank's social progress trust fund to the rural housing program of the Ministry of Health and Social Assistance. The social progress trust fund is a contribution of \$394 million (Bs1,785 million) by the U.S. Government, which is handled and distributed by the Inter-American Development Bank. Here in Táchira, some 788 units have been built under this program, of which approximately 80 were put up with U.S. funds. Over Bs3,260,400 has been invested by the Ministry of Health and Social Assistance in rural housing for Táchira, of which Bs350,000 has come from the trust fund.

"Agency for International Development (AID) loans in the amount of Bs204 million have gone to the Mendoza foundation for housing, the foundation for community development and municipal improvement for slum clearance, and the national savings and loan association to encourage the establishment of a savings and loan system. Both rural and urban housing activities are being complemented by two loans of Bs45 million each from the trust fund for aqueduct construction. At La Fria, INOS will construct an aqueduct system serving more than 4,000 persons with a trust fund loan.

"Venezuela's agrarian reform program is receiving financial assistance in the amount of Bs57.5 million from the Inter-American Development Bank, and Bs45 million from the Agency for International Development to provide agricultural credit to those who could not obtain loans through ordinary commercial channels.

"Another Alliance goal is to help a growing national industry build at an even more rapid rate. Even now, a team of experts from Ebasco Services, Inc., of New York is carrying out Venezuela's first industrial resources survey which is being financed jointly by the United States and Venezuelan Governments. The United States has provided experts who conducted seminars for top management personnel, as well as executive secretaries, simultaneous interpreters, and supervisors in foundry and welding shops. Altogether 748 people have participated in these programs. An additional 80 persons received training in the United States.

"Strong emphasis has been placed on education and training activities with the view of diminishing illiteracy and providing the skills needed for better jobs in industry.

"In education, the United States has equipped an educational materials production shop at the teacher training center, El Mácaro, near Maracay. Soon six textbooks prepared there by Venezuelan authors will be in use in Venezuelan elementary schools. These authors were trained by specialists brought to El Mácaro from the United States. And El Mácaro's staff has access to some 18,000 books donated by the people of the United States under the Alliance for Progress program.

"The U.S. Agency for International Development, cooperating fully with your government, is training Venezuelans to conduct courses in elementary and secondary as well as vocational education, business and plant management, and school supervision. Others have received direct training in Puerto Rico, Panama, and the continental United States in many technical fields such as public administration, metalworking, marketing, agriculture, and many more. Some 350 Venezuelans have received such training abroad during the Alliance's first 18 months.

"Although under the Alliance for Progress the United States contemplates putting more than Bs910 million into Venezuela in the form of long-term, low-interest loans advanced for projects which will improve the

living standards of the Venezuelan people. Disbursements of this amount will be made over a period of 3 or 4 years. This figure includes a loan from the Export-Import Bank of Bs450 million and Bs235 million from the Inter-American Development Bank Trust Fund. This is the U.S. Government's direct financial participation as indicated so far, and, as I have said, must be supplemented manifold by local capital to meet the overall need in this country. I might say, in this context, that the United States is one of two countries in the world which more than fulfills the target of devoting 1 percent of its national income to foreign aid.

"Still in the framework of the Alliance, I want to make a special brief reference to the Peace Corps volunteers—90 now in Venezuela—who are helping the Venezuelans see, through their people-to-people activities in many fields of endeavor, the way a little know-how and experience has helped us solve many problems at the community level. I have been impressed by the work they are doing shoulder to shoulder with their Venezuelan counterparts in agriculture, the teaching of English, sports and playground activities, and other fields. A good number are here in the Andes—35 in 21 towns and villages—engaged in 5-V activities in cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture. The privately sponsored group called AC-CION also is engaged in work along these lines. In both these programs, if their numbers are far short of what is needed, their spirit is certainly one of helpful assistance. A good number of these young people are away from home for the first time. They are trying to learn what the problems are and offer their technical skills to meet those problems. I know they will receive the support and understanding they need.

"I have said on other occasions that Venezuela has been in the forefront of the Alliance for Progress. This is attributable in part to programs which took root here long before Punta del Este, and to the far-sighted leadership which carried on that initial momentum through judicious use of Venezuelan and foreign financing under the Alliance. Venezuela has shown the way to the hemisphere in three important respects: first, conscientious economic and social planning to develop and mobilize the country's resources and direct them toward the goal of genuine self-sustained growth; second, the emphasis on self-help measures and internal changes needed to achieve that goal; and, third, the conscious effort to involve as broad a cross section of the Venezuelan people as possible in the process of development.

"Under a free system Venezuela has been able to plan progress and execute the measures that bring it about. Your government is now in the process of further refining and extending its plans. As you know, a few weeks ago the plan de la nacion was announced—a blueprint for progress to be made in all sectors and in all sections of the country in the 4-year period 1963-67. This plan now is being reviewed by a special committee of the OAS and by private organizations in Venezuela. As it stands, its goal is to increase the gross national product by some 36 percent over today's figure. Taking into consideration a population increase of almost 1 million, the per capita gross national product is expected to go up almost 5 percent. To reach this goal it is anticipated that an investment of Bs28 billion will be available, almost 90 percent from internal sources—two-thirds of it from the private sector. The plan amply reflects the spirit of self-help and involvement of the people.

"Thus, with the elements of planning, self-help and popular involvement, Venezuela is establishing the conditions necessary for balanced economic growth and social betterment within the framework of constitutional democracy. Venezuela has moved ahead with great flexibility toward its goal of

ploughing back petroleum revenues to diversify its economy and social base.

"Few Latin Americans can match Venezuela in the self-help measures undertaken to establish a solid base for the Alliance. These include the creation or improvement of social and economic institutions to meet the needs of the people for new industries, housing, agricultural credit, education and training, better health, and a variety of other public and private services. Although a great deal remains to be done, there have been spectacular gains in education, public administration, land reform, irrigation, resettlement, low-cost housing, water supply, malaria eradication, and medical facilities. Venezuela's national planning is far in advance of many countries in this hemisphere, and I would guess that no other country in the world can cite a 93-percent rise in primary school attendance in 3 years through the construction of 4,481 new schools.

"All these actions tend to create greater opportunities for private as well as public investment, and there has developed the beginnings of an upsurge in industrial activity accompanied by the first drop in unemployment since 1958.

"These indeed are impressive signs of progress. Small wonder, then, that the United States has full confidence in the future of Venezuela under its new found banner of constitutional democracy."

On this occasion of the visit of the President of Venezuela to the United States, I am happy to note in the Senate that new attention is now being given in the American scholarly and journalistic communities to making available to the American public basic information on the American republics in Central and South America. For too long both scholars from the universities and journalists and commentators left the North American public wholly uninformed about Latin America except occasionally to report some bad news—an assassination, an expropriation, an earthquake, or a coup d'etat.

One of the most worthwhile efforts to provide basic information on countries of Latin America is now being conducted by the Institute for Comparative Study of Political Systems, which is a division of Operations and Policy Research, Inc. Both of these institutions are based here in Washington. During the past 6 months the Institute for the Comparative Study of Political Systems has published two election factbooks on two of the major countries in South America, Brazil, and Venezuela. These factbooks aim to provide the basic data on a country prior to an important national election. The book on Brazil appeared earlier this fall, and in January of this year the excellent factbook on Venezuela appeared. This book contains the basic data on the political history of Venezuela, it summarizes the basic issues which are likely to be of significance in the national election which will be held in December of 1963 and it gives a capsule summary of the major political parties. For anyone interested in following the forthcoming national election at the end of this year, this factbook is invaluable. It should be used by professors and high school teachers, journalists, and radio and TV commentators, by public officials in both the executive and legislative branches of the Government, and by all American citizens who are interested in the fate of an important American republic in South America. I congratulate the principal author of these two election factbooks, the man who is the principal driving force behind the Institute for Comparative Study of Political Systems, Mr. George Demetriou. I congratulate the officers of the Operations and Policy Research Corp., which have already done so much to inform the American public and public officials in Washington on the important issues in the field of international af-

airs. Here once again, the executive secretary of the American Political Science Association, Mr. Evon Kirkpatrick, has performed an invaluable service. I attach an excerpt from this excellent publication on Venezuela for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time.

"VENEZUELA: AN OVERVIEW"

"Before examining the political materials in this booklet, the reader will probably wish to refresh his memory of Venezuela. To help him, the following information is offered first about the country as a whole and then about each of the five regions into which it has been divided for the purposes of analysis.

"Venezuela as a whole"

"Size: 352,000 square miles. About 1 1/2 times the size of Texas. Sixth largest country in South America. Population: 7,523,999. Annual population increase over 3 percent—one of highest in Latin America. More than half of population under 20 years. Average life expectancy 52 years. 62.5 percent urban—one of most urban countries in Latin America. Ethnic composition: About two-thirds mestizo; 20 percent white; 9 percent black; less than 2 percent Indian; 8 percent of total population foreign—Italians largest single group. Climate: In Torrid Zone. Temperature varies considerably depending on altitude. Geography: Northernmost country in South America, bordering the Caribbean Sea for 1,754 miles and the Atlantic Ocean for 435 miles. More than 1,000 rivers—Orinoco River, eighth largest in world. Beginning at the Caribbean coast and moving southward, mainland is characterized by a lowland, narrow at center and broadening at both ends to form the Maracaibo Basin in the west and the Orinoco Delta in the east. This lowland slopes into Venezuelan Andes in the west and the coastal range, which parallels the central and eastern coasts. Just south of these mountains lies a large, low, nearly treeless plain which ends in rocky highlands and thick jungles. Economy: Urban and industrial. Oil is axis of economy—provides 90 percent of foreign exchange, 56 percent of government's income, 22 percent of gross national product annual growth, yet employs only 2 percent of the labor force. Standard of living: Annual per capita income \$850 in 1961—highest in Latin America. Income very unevenly distributed both regionally and among sectors of economy; heavy concentration in Caracas and other metropolitan areas and in petroleum industry. Cost of living one of highest in world. Exports: World's leading exporter of oil. Chief customers: Western Hemisphere (67 percent) and Western Europe (29 percent); United States alone takes over half the petroleum. Coffee is chief agricultural export. Other exports: iron ore, cacao, sisal, gold, diamonds. Oil 91.9 percent of total value of exports in 1957; iron ore 4.8 percent; coffee 1.5 percent; other 1.8 percent. Imports: Machinery, construction materials, raw materials, nondurable consumer goods, vehicles, food products. U.S. supplied 64 percent of total imports in 1957. Political geography: Divided into 20 States, two Federal territories, and the Federal District. Some 72 island dependencies governed by the Federal District.

"By regions"

"Maracaibo Basin"

"State: Zulia. Principal cities: Maracaibo (432,902), second largest city in Venezuela; growth due to discovery of nearby oil. Climate and geography: Narrow strip of lowland between Andes and the sea in northwest section of Venezuela. Hot, humid; seldom a day when temperature falls to reach 90° F. Site of Lake Maracaibo, containing largest known deposits of petroleum in South America; lake is shallow and studded with

oil derricks. Population: 908,733—12 percent of total Venezuelan population in 6.9 percent of the national land area; 45 percent of region's population concentrated in city of Maracaibo; 23 percent rural. Economy: Produces nearly three-fourths of national output of petroleum. Good agricultural area. Western portion a center of dairying and cattle fattening. Political characteristics: 12 percent of electorate; 40 percent of population voted in 1958 election.

"Andean States"

"States: Táchira, Mérida, Trujillo. Principal cities: San Cristóbal (96,102), sixth largest city in Venezuela; Mérida (40,404). Climate and geography: Cool and moist; spectacular landscapes. Very healthful region. Population: 996,465—13.2 percent of total Venezuelan population in 3.3 percent of the national land area. About 64 percent rural. Economy: Important agricultural region. Chief products: coffee, cacao, sugarcane, rice, wheat, corn, and vegetable fibers. Industrial activity: flour and sugar milling, tanning, and manufacture of shoes, ceramics, and furniture. Mérida reputed to produce best quality coffee in Venezuela. Quaint colonial cities are popular tourist attractions. Political characteristics: 12.9 percent of electorate; 38 percent of nationwide COPEI vote comes from this region. Supplied Presidents from 1899-1958 with the exception of the 1945-48 period.

"Coastal Range"

"States: Falcón, Lara, Yaracuy, Carabobo, Aragua, Federal District, Miranda, Nueva Esparta, Sucre. A very heterogeneous region for which generalizations are difficult. Caracas and surrounding area is heart of political and economic activity. Most of Venezuela's largest cities lie in this region. Principal cities: Caracas (739,255), Barquisimeto (196,557), Valencia (161,413), Maracay (134,123), Cumaná (71,563). Climate and geography: Mostly mild climate but some parts very hot and humid. Narrow, mountainous strip with fertile mountain valleys. Andes Mountains spur extends west to east for 310 miles and north to south for 43 miles. Population: 3,941,139—53 percent of total Venezuelan population in 8.7 percent of the national land area. Averages 38 percent rural with extremes of no rural in the Federal District and 59 percent in Sucre. Economy: Most important industrial and manufacturing area. Rich agricultural areas. Cattle raising. Caracas is tourist attraction. Pearl fishing in islands off northeast coast. Political characteristics: 53 percent of electorate. Extremist parties strong in big cities of this area compared with strength elsewhere in country.

"Llanos"

"States: Guárico, Apure, Barinas, Portuguesa, Cojedes, Anzoátegui, Monagas, Delta Amacuro (territory). Principal cities: Puerto La Cruz (59,099), Maturín (54,250), Barcelona (42,267), El Tigre (42,028). Climate and geography: Flat, wide expanses; partly cleared savannas and partly dense jungles. Torrential rains from April to October; very dry during rest of year. Population: 1,440,371—18 percent of total Venezuelan population in 35.5 percent of national land area. More than 60 percent rural. Economy: Traditional cattle country. Transition taking place—former pastures have been converted into rice, corn, and sesame fields. Very little industrial development. Political characteristics: 19.1 percent of the electorate. Stronghold of the Acción Democrática Party.

"Guayana Highlands"

"States: Bolívar, Amazonas (territory). Principal city: Ciudad Bolívar (64,133). Climate and geography: Lies east and south of the Orinoco River. Rocky masses, with high iron content and some petroleum, lead into lowlands and thick jungles ending in spec-

tacular mountains with flat tops and sheer sides. Site of Angel Falls, highest free fall in the world. Large forested areas, largely unexplored. Population: 225,300—3 percent of total Venezuelan population in 45.1 percent of the national land area. About four-fifths of the small Indian population of Venezuela lives here. Economy: Extensive recent industrial development. Iron ore in El Pal Mountain. Gold, diamonds. Largely untapped supply of lumber and minerals. Political characteristics: 2.9 percent of the electorate.

"SOME FACTS OF POLITICAL HISTORY"

"The discontinuity of political institutions has been a major characteristics of the history of Venezuela, which has had 26 constitutions since 1830. The highest law of the land has been changes so frequently—sometimes casually, often violently—that it has been little respected by either rulers or ruled. Fifty major rebellions and thirteen violent overthrows of the Central Government occurred between 1830 and 1900. From 1900 to 1935 and from 1948 to 1958 the country lived under brutal dictatorships. Today in Venezuela a legitimately elected President is constantly threatened by militant Communist, leftist, and rightist conspirators, and most of his constitutional term of office has been spent in a state of emergency which grants him extraordinary powers to deal with attempts to overthrow the Government.

"The violent adjudication of political differences is a central aspect of the Venezuelan tradition, and in the 20th century the armed forces have become the dominant institution of Venezuelan politics. Historically the armed forces have supported military dictators; but in 1945 and 1958 the groups within the Venezuelan Army made possible the establishment of civilian governments. In 1963 the duly elected Government, menaced as it is by attempts at violent subversion, could not exist without the firm support of the armed forces. If the military officers who believe that the armed forces should support constitutional government remain in control, it is possible that the present military support will continue and be extended to all future duly elected civilian governments.

"Seven periods"

"War of Independence, 1810-30"

"Led by Simón Bolívar, its immortal native son, Venezuela won independence in 1821 after 11 years of war that caused heavy loss of life. Venezuela separated from Gran Colombia in 1830.

"Rule of Conservative Oligarchy, 1830-48"

"Period of free elections and stable political institutions, honestly administered. Great stabilizing figure was General José Antonio Páez.

"Divisions in Conservative Oligarchy; Rise of the Liberal Opposition, 1848-99"

"Period of revolutions and constitutions. "Federalism" and "centralism" were partisan rallying cries, but there were no attempts to create specific structures of government. Developing liberal movement articulated for Venezuela the ideals of 19th century liberalism, but culminated in disillusion engendered by dictatorship of liberal Antonio Guzmán Blanco. Guzmán Blanco did much to modernize Venezuela.

"The Andean Dictators, 1899-1945"

"Country ruled by Gen. Cipriano Castro from 1899 until 1908 and by his lieutenant, Gen. Juan Vicente Gómez, from 1908 until 1935. Under Gómez, country opened to carefully restricted petroleum development and army modernized. Period of brutality, terror, and total absence of civil rights. Death of Gómez in 1935 followed by tumultuous riots, destruction, looting, and killing. From 1935 through 1945 country governed by Gens. Eleazar López Contreras and Isaias Medina Angarita, both officers of Gómez; wide

range of civil and political liberties granted intermittently.

"Revolt of the Young Officers and Brief Democratic Interval, 1945-48

"In alliance with Acción Democrática (AD), a group of young army officers led revolution successfully deposing Gen. Medina Angarita. Revolution marked end of dominance of army and landed aristocracy coalition. Mixed civilian-military junta took control. In 1948 open and honest elections held for constituent assembly. Creation of very liberal constitution was followed in 1947 by presidential and congressional elections won by AD party. Shortly after assuming office in 1948 President Rómulo Gallegos suspended constitutional guarantees. AD party opposed by groups on both left and right, and by army officers who, aware that AD was strongly antimilitary, feared army would become inferior group. New military coup ousted elected government in November 1948.

"Counterrevolution of Col. Marcos Pérez Jiménez, 1948-58

"Three-man military junta took over government. Col. Carlos Delgado Chalbaud, head of junta, assassinated in 1950. Pérez Jiménez became dictator. Dictator held elections in 1952. All parties except AD allowed to participate. Election returns honestly counted and reported until it became obvious that government party was losing. News blackout put into effect, followed by announcement that government had won elections. Pérez Jiménez proclaimed President for constitutional 5-year term. At end of term Pérez Jiménez held plebiscitary elections in which people could vote yes or no to his continuance in office. Victory for yes was reported and touched spark to widespread antidictatorial sentiment fostered by clandestine political groups and by elements within the church. In 1958 civilians and parts of army revolted successfully, and new military junta, headed by Adm. Wolfgang Larrazabal, made election plans.

"The Presidency of Rómulo Betancourt, 1958-62

"All political parties legal participants in elections of December 7, 1958. Elections regarded as free and honest, won by Betancourt and AD party.

"In office Betancourt administration has instituted programs for agrarian reform, building of schools and low-cost housing, reduction of illiteracy, encouragement of private investment, diversification of economy. There is disagreement about extent of success of these programs.

"Constitutional guarantees of civil liberties legally suspended by President Betancourt during most of term of office. How repressive the exercise of presidential power has been is another matter about which there is disagreement.

"Betancourt has until now successfully faced constant armed challenge from Communist Party. AD has had two splits since taking power; in 1960 a group separated from AD to become MIR party, and in 1962, another group split to become ARS group. Voting strength taken from AD by dissident groups not known.

"Elective offices to be filled

"President of the Republic.

"Entire National Chamber of Deputies.

"Entire National Senate.

"Legislatures in all 20 States.

"All municipal councils.

"Venezuela is a Federal republic of 20 States, the Federal District, two Federal territories, and a number of minor island dependencies. Since the constitutional 5-year terms of the President and the Members of Congress expire on March 3, 1964, elections have been scheduled for December 1963.

"If they are held, the elections will be for national, State, and municipal offices.

"National offices to be filled are the Presidency, the entire Federal Senate, and the entire Federal Chamber of Deputies. Senators, elected indirectly in 1958, are now to be elected directly.

"All State legislatures and municipal councils will also be elected at this time. Under the constitution elections for State and municipal offices may not be held more often than once every 2 years or less often than once every 5 years. On January 1, 1964, the term of office for all State and local officials throughout the country will expire. State governors are still appointed and removed by the President."

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HOUSING

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the former Governor of my Commonwealth, David Leo Lawrence, has come to Washington, D.C., as Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing. He has taken up his office in the Executive Office of the President, at the White House, and has gone to work hard to fulfill the purpose for which he was appointed; which, in effect, is to render effective the Executive order issued by the President dealing with integrated housing.

Last week, in connection with the celebration of Lincoln's Birthday anniversary, former Governor Lawrence made an extremely striking and able speech at Springfield, Ill., on the subject of his new official duties. I commend this speech to all Members of the Senate and to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY DAVID L. LAWRENCE

I cannot think of any more appropriate place or symbolic time for this conference than here in Springfield—the land of Lincoln—during this week when we observe the anniversary of the birth of Lincoln.

Last Tuesday, on Lincoln's birthday, I was pleased to be among those invited to the White House reception where the 35th President of the United States paid honor to the memory of the 16th president. And I was delighted to see there many of those who have been in forefront of the work to extend the principles and the philosophies which were first set forth in the Declaration of Independence and then put into specific meaning, a hundred years ago, in the Emancipation Proclamation.

Equally impressive at the reception was the publication of a remarkable report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights dealing with the progress the Nation has made in this field during the past hundred years. Entitled "Freedom to the Free" is a volume for all Americans to read, particularly those of us who have helped lead the continuing effort to make certain that we truly achieve freedom for all of the free.

In reading the report, I was struck by a perceptive statement made in 1835 by the young French nobleman, Alexis de Tocqueville, comparing the United States and Russia. "These two great nations," de Tocqueville commented, "started from different points, but seem to tend toward the same end. The conquests of the Americans are gained by the plowshare; those of the Russian by the sword. The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends and gives free scope to the unguided strength and the commonsense of the people; the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm. The principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter, servitude."

Not only does the analysis remain appropriate in today's troubled world, but it points up, with equal aptness, the vital importance of citizen action such as that being mobilized here today.

The effectiveness of any government action—whether local, State, or Federal—depends directly upon the support of private citizens and upon groups such as those represented at this conference.

You undoubtedly know that there are approximately 200 fair housing committees active in communities from one end of this country to the other.

These are committees, like those represented here, organized specifically for this purpose by citizens who believe their community would be healthier if it is open to persons of all races, colors, and creeds.

The work of local fair housing committees is vital in obtaining local and State legislation to support the objectives of equal opportunity in housing. Their work is no less important in achieving the objective of the Executive order on equal opportunity in housing which President Kennedy signed last November 20.

That action by the President was a historic one, marking the culmination of an evolving process of active forces which caused a shift in Federal housing policy. Not many years ago, that policy was one of supporting residential segregation and unequal housing opportunity. Today, under the Executive order, the policy calls for an active role in preventing discriminatory barriers and requiring equal opportunity in federally assisted and federally-owned housing.

The President, as you know, directed the various Federal executive departments and agencies to take action to prevent discrimination in the housing programs they administer. These departments and agencies have now issued regulations to implement the order in their programs, and the President has appointed me his Special Assistant to head the Committee that will work to see that the purposes of the order are carried out with fairness and integrity. I firmly believe this can be done, and I pledge my best efforts to make certain that it actually is done.

I should like to note, with what I hope is pardonable pride, that my native city of Pittsburgh, when I was mayor, was the second city to enact comprehensive fair housing legislation covering private housing, and my home State of Pennsylvania did the same in 1961, when I was its Governor.

The mounting trend toward equal opportunity in housing is reflected in the passage of State and city measures dealing with equality of housing opportunities by 17 other States, the Virgin Islands, and more than 50 cities.

Such legislation has emerged largely during the decade from 1954, when New York City enacted the first law prohibiting discrimination and segregation in publicly assisted housing, including housing made possible by FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed loans.

Within the next 3 years, six States (New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Washington, and Oregon) enacted similar statutes. The pace accelerated after December 1957, when New York City again became the first to extend its fair housing law to cover private housing without Government assistance. Thereafter through September 1962, 11 States, 3 cities, and the Virgin Islands enacted fair housing laws covering some portion of private housing. These 11 States have a population of over 55 million or over 38 percent of our total national population. Also they have more than

The weather information from our satellites will be one of the great advances forward for agriculture throughout the world—as well as in our own country.

The prospects for our communications satellites in space also defy the imagination. We will be able to have telephone communication between all parts of all continents. We will be able to have joint television conferences between the leaders of many nations simultaneously. We will be able to transmit the written word at phenomenal rates of speed—a book the size of the Bible can be transmitted in a matter of seconds.

The advances which will come in that field of communications are innumerable.

In 1963, we expect to have operational the Transit system of navigational satellites. These satellites will permit navigators on the seas to determine their position within 0.1 mile, a degree of accuracy never before ever approached. Again, the savings will be great and far reaching.

These are only a few selected examples of what the technology of the space age will mean when applied for peaceful and practical purposes of the future. More important to all of us, however, is the necessity of realizing how great will be the changes this age of space will bring to our lives, to our occupations, and to our whole society and economy in America.

The age of space which we are now entering will dwarf man's memory of the impact of the industrial revolution. Every sector and every facet of our economy and our daily lives will be altered by the impact of these next years to come. The impact will be felt by us all in terms of the demands this new age will make upon us for greater productivity, for greater capability among our people, and for the greater rewards that will come to us all.

If America is to continue to hold the leadership we have now achieved—and follow in the tradition of leadership we have known since the beginning of our country—the next 25 years will make it necessary for us to marshal our resources to the fullest. We as a nation shall not be able to tolerate the idleness of either our natural resources or our human resources. We shall need the full total of the national strength we can command to realize the promise and fulfill the opportunities of the age of space.

In this context, as each of you here know, the day will come when a grateful America will be made glad that it has in its rural sections the rural electric cooperatives of today.

At the time the REA program was conceived and implemented in the 1930's, our objective was to light the homes of our rural sectors. That objective has in large measure been accomplished. But in strengthening the rural life of America, the REA program has built a foundation of strength on which now the structure of industrial expansion can and must be put into place. In the next 25 years, the rural electric cooperatives of the United States will be lighting the lamp of our Nation's progress.

We can see the beginnings and the implications of this here in the region where we meet.

I am thinking of the Hoover Dam and the Parker Davis project built by the generation that preceded us. The dam and project are indispensable to the continued growth of this region. Without the water provided for irrigation and hydroelectric power, this land might still be a desert, this oasis might still be without its thousands of lights.

But I am thinking too of how the intelligent development of our water resources through the dam and project is helping some of your friends and neighbors to start a new rural electric cooperative. This new cooperative will serve nearly 600 families who will receive central station electric serv-

ice for the first time. One of the members of that cooperative—and probably its largest consumer—is the Atomic Energy Commission station at Jackass Flats.

The demand for electric power for the New Horizon enterprises at Jackass Flats made it possible for the cooperative to prove its feasibility and build its system. This project, where nuclear engines for spacecraft are being tested, is an example of the kind of use and development America will be making of these regions of the West.

The part which rural electric cooperatives play in these projects here is symbolic of the part that rural electric cooperatives will play in the future of these next decades of space exploration.

America is about to contemplate what is contemplated now in the exploration of outer space because a generation ago Americans wisely directed their energies and resources to development of space here on earth—the space of rural America. In this great effort the rural electrification program was from the beginning the foundation program for success of our national effort to strengthen the whole economy by strengthening the agricultural economy. Putting first things first, proceeding on a course of prudence and vision, we have through REA made our Nation stronger and made the horizons of today's generation broader.

When men seek places and means of economizing on government costs, let them turn their efforts constructively to examining the problems which keep us from realizing our full potential. Most of the costs of government domestically, and even internationally, arise not from the programs but from the failure to deal with the problems which necessitate the programs. In the world today, despite the progress of this century, poverty still abounds, disease still afflicts part of this earth's population, illiteracy still restricts the development of human minds. These are problems we can overcome. These are the problems we must overcome if we are to pay the price of freedom's survival in our own lives and in our own times.

If governments are to be prudent, they must follow their hearts without losing their heads. We living today must recognize that it is our special responsibility in the history of America and in the history of the human race to be privileged to put in place the foundations on which man's enjoyment of freedom and hope for peace will stand for centuries to come. A part of that foundation is and will always be the stability, the success, and the prosperity of agriculture and of life in the rural areas. We shall need to continue in this country to concern ourselves with that foundation of stability, success, and prosperity for rural America, and that means we must continue our support of the rural electrification program as a vital part of the foundations of our Nation's future.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, when Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt died, countless persons throughout the world vied in paying tribute to the memory of that great lady. No tribute was more moving, nor more eloquent, nor more from the heart than that delivered by her lifelong friend, the Honorable Frances P. Perkins, former Secretary of Labor. Miss Perkins, addressing a meeting of the Democratic National Committee, spoke extemporaneously. Fortunately her remarks were recorded and printed for the benefit of those who could not be present.

Mr. President, I ask that the transcript of this statement be printed at this time

in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all may read this remarkable eulogy from one great lady to another.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT BY THE HONORABLE FRANCES PERKINS, FORMER SECRETARY OF LABOR, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE MEETING, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 19, 1963

Mr. Chairman, when Eleanor Roosevelt died, millions of her fellow countrymen stopped short in their tracks, and as they wrestled with a catch in their throats, they found the words to say very briefly and very simply, "she was a good woman," and that is just about what they meant when they thought it over. The most they could say, the greatest thing they could say about her was, she was a good woman. And some of the simpler among them added, "Thank God for Mrs. Roosevelt."

The simple people always thought that she was the one who had brought them the necessities of life which they were without when she walked into Washington, beside her husband to be sure, but they, understanding so little of where the relief came from, and who it was among the Senators and the Congressmen who had voted that immediate relief in a time of depression, thought that Mrs. Roosevelt had given it to them.

We lost a familiar friend. This was one thing we all knew.

Never again should we see a familiar figure climbing down a ladder into a coal mine, no longer would we see a lady looking as though she might trip on her skirts peering over into the pit of some great industrial enterprise where the flames were rising.

These were the pictures that every American had in his mind and in his heart about her. But the words never came which were what we really meant. We learned from the press that the whole world had a kind of mourning for this woman who although ill, and we all knew she was ill, had gone to her great reward. We all knew this, but we hadn't realized it. Eleanor Roosevelt was a person who primarily was effective; important because of what she was rather than what she did, and this I think, as I have thought about her afterwards, is what her great contribution was. She was—she became these things, she was the kind of person she was, and that was more important than any of the manifold and multiple things which she did and which she said.

Just think what her life was. Think how like she was to all the poor and the struggling of this country; a life begun in a very unpromising way, an orphan child, lonely, unhappy at times; kindly, but impersonally treated, shy, timid, afraid of things, striving only to be of no trouble and to be good, because otherwise she was a nuisance to her relatives.

This was a sad and self-conscious child who grew up with an inadequate education, passed around from one relative to another, finally sent to England to go to school, out of her own country, when she was only 15, a little girl.

She never went to any dancing parties in the evening. She didn't know any young people at home. She knew only some of the young girls she went to school with in England. She knew no other young people, she once said to me. She didn't know what they were like in America, and yet she came home at 18 and prepared to do her duty. Her duty was her first word in those days.

But gradually she grew, she grew, she grew. Something had happened to her. I think it was her own nature developing within her. She began to be expressive of

accepted full responsibility for that tragic result and acknowledged that he made all the crucial decisions that contributed to that humiliating defeat.

For such a confession and acceptance of responsibility, President Kennedy literally became a national hero. In an amazing and almost unbelievable psychological phenomenon, he thus converted a tragic blot on his record—a disastrous failure for which he is admittedly responsible—into a national badge of honor merely because he admitted his responsibility. It was almost like a general being given the Congressional Medal of Honor by the American public because he had admitted that he made grave errors that he shouldn't have and which resulted in his troops being wiped out. Quickly forgotten was the disastrous failure—it was wiped out by the mere confession of guilt.

Thus, I cannot understand why the Attorney General would raise the issue again with his denial—for what he did merely served to remind the American people of the very tragic blunder and defeat that his brother had responsibility for regardless of whether any air support had been promised and regardless of whether the lack of air support contributed heavily to that tragic defeat.

What the Attorney General did has raised serious doubts in the minds of many people as to the judgment and wisdom of the Kennedy administration—and more specifically with respect to the Attorney General himself, a question as to whether he possesses the desired wisdom and judgment of a man who aspires to succeed his brother as President.

And speaking on this subject of the American public getting the full facts and truth, since I last reported to you on this program I have had a small and minor problem on this myself. On January 24, 1963, there appeared in the Portland Press-Herald by its Washington correspondent an item about a reception given by Representative and Mrs. McIntire. That item caused some constituents to inquire of me if there was any hard feeling between Representative McIntire and me.

Their inquiry was prompted by what the item stated and I quote from the item:

"Senator Muskie and Representative and Mrs. Tupper attended the reception with a host of other congressional colleagues."

They got the impression that either Representative McIntire didn't invite me or I didn't accept the invitation since the item indicated that I was the only member of the Maine congressional delegation not attending the reception.

I want to take this opportunity to assure you that no hard feeling exists and that any indication that the quoted item may indicate otherwise is very inaccurate. For what is the truth—and what the item did not reveal—is that I did attend the reception. In fact, I was one of the very first persons to arrive at the reception at 7 p.m. on the dot—and the next morning Representative McIntire called me on the telephone to express his warm thanks for my attending the reception.

What is very mystifying about the item indicating that I did not attend the reception is the fact that I shook hands with the Washington correspondent of the Portland Press-Herald as she arrived and came up to the reception line and in the presence of Mrs. McIntire. It is puzzling that she would omit my name from her story for I am sure that she recognized me when we shook hands because she called me "Senator Smith."

VICE PRESIDENT ADDRESSES ANNUAL MEETING OF RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last month Vice President LYNDON B. JOHN-

SON addressed the annual meeting of the Rural Electric Cooperatives Association in Las Vegas, Nev. The Vice President pointed to the historic importance of the REA movement in this country and the tremendous effect it has had on the development of rural America. A most significant part of the message was the role that the rural electric cooperative will play in the next several decades of space exploration. This is an area in which the Vice President is deeply interested and informed. He has alerted the association to a new area of development, a new role for the electric cooperative.

The Vice President's speech was a highlight of the convention and according to all reports was very well received. Mr. President, I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have the text of this speech printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES ASSOCIATION, ANNUAL MEETING, LAS VEGAS, NEV., WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 16, 1963

In the early years of our country, Americans then—as now—were concerned with the costs of the Federal Government. When the Capital was moved from Philadelphia to Washington, some were greatly alarmed because it required a total of seven boxes to ship the files of the U.S. Government.

That started the search for places to cut back and economize. Among others, it was decided that an ideal place to reduce expenditures was the U.S. Patent Office. The solemn recommendation was made that the Patent Office should be closed—because it was certain that the Patent Office had outlived its usefulness since everything that was worth inventing had already been invented.

That episode has been repeated many times. I do not recall it now in any spirit of ridiculing economizing on the cost of government. A compelling fact of our times is that all our people—liberals as well as conservatives—farmers as well as city residents, laborers as well as management executives—have a great and growing responsibility to join together to keep our public expenditures prudent at every level—Federal, State, and local.

Fiscal prudence is not a partisan dividing line. Neither is Government efficiency. We must continually examine and reexamine our public programs to keep them realistic and responsive to genuine needs. We must terminate those of the past which are no longer needed to make room for those which the future requires.

But too often too many are too quick to conclude that foundation programs—those programs which build a stronger base for national growth and expansion—are the expendable programs when in fact these are the indispensable activities of our Government. This is today—as it has been for a quarter century—true of the rural electrification program.

In the 1930's this Nation embarked upon a great effort to strengthen itself—and strengthen its capacity to support the cause of freedom—by building the foundation of new strength in the agricultural and rural sectors of America. In the 1950's, when we began to achieve a degree of success with those efforts, many were quick to demand that we abolish the programs responsible for that success and, while we were at it, abolish the farmers, too.

The rural electrification program has been—and continues to be—the favorite target of the wrecking crews. As one who has worked as Congressman, as Senator, and as

Vice President for 25 years in support of REA, it gives me a great sense of satisfaction to come before you today as a member of an administration which has said—and will continue to say—"No" to those wrecking crews.

Coming here to the great vastness of our American West, it would be impossible for any man to agree with those who argue that the job of building rural America is a job which Americans can consider to be finished.

We are what we are in this land—as a people, as a nation, and as a political system—because we have had present throughout our history the great reserve of unused land, unused resources, and unoccupied space. The presence of these assets has meant much to the freedom of the society in which we live—and to the dignity of the individual under our society. At this point in history, we can see more clearly than ever we have seen before just how important is the development of the underdeveloped regions of our own country to the future strength and success of our country and our cause.

We are moving at a rapid rate into a new era of human adventure and exploration in the realms of outer space. It is my privilege to be associated with this national effort as Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council which advises with the President of the United States on the space programs of our Nation.

In less than 5 years, our country has assumed a solid and secure place of leadership in developing the peaceful and practical uses of outer space. Where once we were, in the judgment of some, lagging behind, today we are, on the basis of clear evidence, forging ahead. Our efforts in space are in no way dictated by a policy of duplicating the activities of the Soviet. We are not engaged in a race with Communist scientists—we are engaged in a race to extend the horizons of man's knowledge and to increase the benefits which will better the lives of all men who live on this earth.

In 1962 the United States enjoyed a year of great successes. Young Americans orbited the earth for the first time. We began to communicate through space to other continents. As the year ended American rockets were flying past far-away planets and transmitting to earth our first knowledge of these other planets in our universe.

While our successes were both substantial and conspicuous, the most important works of space continue to be the steady progress we are making toward peaceful and practical uses of space technology in our own times. We are concentrating our efforts at present in three fields: weather, communications and navigation.

On weather, in the not distant future we shall have achieved technical capability of great benefit to all the nations on earth. Satellites above us will have all portions of the earth under their steady gaze 24 hours a day. We will be able to know far more than we know now about the weather of the world—and our uses of this knowledge will mean great savings of lives, property, and economic costs.

Our weather satellites will be able to give us information about the snow cover on our own continent, to make the spring runoff predictable. The same satellites will give us knowledge we do not have now about the ice fields on the Great Lakes and our inland waterways. It is estimated that such information about the St. Lawrence Waterway alone will save shippers more than \$2 million each season. We will be able to prevent the loss of our timber resources through costly forest fires which now smoulder on the forest floor for many days before the presence of the fire is known. We will be able to work with the 60 nations of the world which spend more than \$15 million annually trying to control the age-old plague of locusts.

upon which we have now entered. In his speech at Freeport, Mr. Lincoln said:

"For my part, I do hope that all of us, entertaining a common sentiment in opposition to what appears to us a design to nationalize and perpetuate slavery, will waive minor differences on questions which either belong to the dead past or the distant future, and all pull together in this struggle."—Lincoln and Douglas Debates, page 107.

The success of the Republican party, which has been inaugurated by the nomination of Mr. Lincoln, will bring with it great duties and grave responsibilities. A strict observance of the Constitution and an inflexible administration of the law must be its rule. It must practice the most rigid economy in every department of the Government; repress with a vigorous hand all abuses that have crept into its administration; bring about fraternal feeling; reanimate industry; clear out the pathways, and spread the sails of commerce. It must save the common Territories of the United States from the curse of slavery; reestablish the public credit, and restore confidence between man and man. The immediate reestablishment of the public good must be its first great object, and the peace and prosperity of the country will be assured.

Mr. Lincoln has been but little in public life, and he will come into the presidential chair "fresh from the people," with "no friends to reward, and no enemies to punish." He has no complications with politicians, cliques, or factions, and no outstanding promises requiring redemption. One of the people, taken up by the people, he will be the President of the people. In him there are united the elements which challenged the confidence of the convention which nominated him, and of the people who will elect him. He is emphatically a representative man; and, by the simplicity of his manners, and the purity of his private life, he is the type of the virtues which belong to a great Republic. There is an inflexible patriotism in his heart, and he has the incorruptibility of Republican principles in his soul. He has doctrines, not hatreds, and is without ambition, except to do good, and serve his country.

In these days, when corruption, prodigality, and venality have reached the very vitals of the Government, the people have at last found an honest man to administer the affairs of the nation in the spirit in which our institutions were founded; a man whose name has ever been the synonym of probity and honor; whose reputation, in all the relations of private life, is without blemish, as his public career is without reproach. No man ever has, and no man ever can, place his finger upon a single dishonorable or improper act of his life. He stands to-day, as a private citizen and public man, unassailed and unassailable.

"An honest man, the noblest work of God."
Of no man can it more truly be said:
"His life is gentle; and the elements
So mixed in him, that Nature might stand
up
And say to all the world, this is a man."

SCHOOL AID MONEY NEEDED FOR STATE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the need for congressional action on President Kennedy's omnibus education bill, particularly insofar as West Virginia is concerned, is cogently argued by Mr. Phil Hirsch in his column, "Washington Watch" which appeared in the February 14, 1963, edition of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette.

Stating that West Virginia would greatly benefit if the administration's education bill receives congressional approval in its present form, Mr. Hirsch tells of the significance of such aid to my State:

This would be nearly four times more than the Mountain State is receiving now—

Mr. Hirsch declares, adding that—Thousands of poor teenagers could obtain the education they need to keep off the breadline; long-deferred plans to build new elementary, secondary, and college classrooms could be launched, and there might even be a chance of reducing the vast number of youngsters throughout the State now receiving instructions from teachers who never finished college.

While Mr. Hirsch goes on to discuss the many aspects of the omnibus education bill, and what each of these could mean for the advancement of education in West Virginia, I want to especially draw attention to his concluding remarks, because they highlight an erosion in the American destiny which we, in the Congress, have the power to change:

The pending bill—

Mr. Hirsch states—

Authorizes \$400 million in grants to local school districts, in fiscal 1964. West Virginia's share would be about \$5.5 million.

In fiscal 1962, about \$22 million was spent on public-school construction throughout the State—

He continues, adding:

Just imagine how many double shifts and leaky, drafty, decrepit schoolhouses could have been eliminated if this figure had been \$5.5 million higher.

Mr. President, I believe that the plight of education in West Virginia is the same as that which faces many other States in the Nation. But I can only speak for the Mountain State, and in so doing I can only call attention to the patriotic purposes in the national effort to develop the mental powers and abilities of every child and of every teenager in this country. In strengthening our educational system, we are giving new firmness to the greatest bulwark against the loss of our freedom to Communist tyranny.

What we do about our educational system today—to catch up with the lag in school construction, in the development and training of required numbers of teachers, and in better pay for our teachers—will shape the growth and power of our country tomorrow. If this requires a new marshalling of our resources, then let us get on with the task, for time is no longer on our side. The Russians are already graduating more engineers, technicians, and scientists each year than we are.

I would commend to the Congress, as a slogan to bear in mind during the course of debates on the President's omnibus education bill, so that the purposes of the bill are not lost in partisan fire: "A good American is an educated American."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Hirsch's column printed in the Record at this time.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WASHINGTON WATCH

(By Phil Hirsch)

SCHOOL AID MONEY NEEDED FOR STATE

West Virginia will get roughly \$13 million worth of Federal aid during the year beginning next July 1 if the administration's omnibus education bill passes Congress in its present form.

This would be nearly four times more than the Mountain State is receiving now. Thousands of poor teenagers could obtain the education they need to keep off the breadline; long-deferred plans to build new elementary, secondary, and college classrooms could be launched, and there might even be a chance of reducing the vast number of youngsters throughout the State now receiving instructions from teachers who never finished college.

The bill won't pass in its present form because southern, Catholic, and conservative Members of both Houses have enough votes to block several key provisions. But there is a better than even chance that a number of other provisions, almost as beneficial, will get through the congressional meat-grinder relatively intact.

The college student loan program is one of the least controversial parts of the new bill. For the past 5 years, needy graduate and undergraduate students attending private and public colleges and universities have been able to borrow up to \$1,000 a year to finance their educations; most of this money has been supplied by the Federal Government. The administration wants to increase the fund in fiscal 1964 from the present \$90 million to \$135 million annually, and allow most students to borrow up to \$2,500 a year.

The pending bill also provides Federal loan insurance. Students could borrow up to \$50 million from banks and other commercial lending institutions at lower-than-market interest rates. Under a related provision of the National Education Improvement Act of 1963, the Federal Government would help other students work their way through college or university; the bill sets aside \$22.5 million in 1964 to cover half their pay. The rest would come from school or State funds. Undergrads could earn as much as \$1,000 a year, graduate students \$2,000 a year.

In 1962, West Virginia college and university students received educational loans totaling \$963,203. The proposed program would increase this figure to more than \$1.5 million.

There is a crying need throughout West Virginia for more 2-year colleges. The new bill makes \$50 million in Federal funds available to all the States on a 50-50 matching basis; this money could be used to build junior college classrooms or pay their teachers. West Virginia's share would be approximately \$750,000. The bill limits Federal aid to public junior colleges, but this provision isn't likely to stir up the church-State education feud because virtually all parochial colleges are 4-year institutions.

Another part of the bill likely to pass largely in its present form is the vocational education program. Approximately \$73 million in Federal grants would be provided on a matching basis (versus \$50 million this year) to finance classes for high school students, dropouts, unemployed youth, those with jobs who are interested in upgrading themselves, and handicapped workers. The money could also be spent on area vocational schools. The most significant difference between the new vocational-education program and the old one is that in future, a student could be trained for a skill needed elsewhere in his State. At present, each

educational training program must be related directly to the occupational needs of the local labor market.

The new bill increases Federal aid to public libraries sixfold, from \$7 1/2 million annually to \$45 million. It also removes an existing restriction which limits aid to rural areas and to communities which have 10,000 population or less. If that ban is kept out of the final bill, Charleston's public library system could receive Federal aid for the first time. West Virginia received \$162,798 in library aid during fiscal 1962. The new bill would raise that figure to more than half a million dollars in the coming fiscal year.

The most controversial parts of the President's educational package are: a basic education program for adults who haven't finished grade school; Federal loans for the construction of higher education facilities; and Federal grants to elementary and secondary school systems which could be used either for bricks and mortar or for salaries.

The basic education program, would be worth about \$55,000 to West Virginia during the next fiscal year. It is opposed by southerners; they fear it would encourage Negroes to vote and seek better jobs, thus destroying the semi-feudal society that still exists in many areas below the Mason-Dixon line.

The bill commits a billion dollars for construction of college and university academic facilities. One of the beneficiaries would be West Virginia University, which recently announced plans for a \$30 million expansion program, but is almost certainly going to have trouble digging up the cash. If this Federal aid program was approved, it would enable West Virginia to as much as \$125 million in long-term, low-interest loans.

But construction loans are caught in a crossfire between public and private school advocates. Each group, basically, wants grants instead because they don't have to be repaid. However, both the administration and those against Federal aid to private schools say general grants to nonpublic educational institutions are unconstitutional.

This is also the argument underlying the debate over Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools. The pending bill authorizes \$400 million in grants to local school districts in fiscal 1964. West Virginia's share would be about \$5.5 million.

In fiscal 1962, about \$22 million was spent on public school construction throughout the State. Just imagine how many double shifts and leaky, drafty, decrepit school-houses could have been eliminated if this figure had been \$5.5 million higher.

SOVIET MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN CUBA

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on February 10, 1963, I made a report on station WGAN, of Portland, Maine, to the listeners of that area. I ask unanimous consent that that broadcast of mine be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH, CONGRESSIONAL REPORT, WGAN, PORTLAND, MAINE, FEBRUARY 10, 1963

Since reporting to you on this program 4 weeks ago there has been a great change in the atmosphere here in Washington. Four weeks ago Congress had just started its session—and that start had been in an atmosphere of great national confidence stemming from the Cuban stand that President Kennedy had taken in the latter part of October just before the November congressional elections.

I shall never forget how Americans held their heads high the morning of October 23, 1962, after the President had made his speech the night before announcing that we would fight if Khrushchev did not remove the Russian missiles in Cuba aimed at the United States. At long last, we had decided to stop Khrushchev from pushing us around. And Americans, Republicans as well as Democrats, were very proud of their Democratic President.

Much of that feeling of pride still existed 4 weeks ago when I spoke to you on this program at the beginning of the congressional session. But that it is not true today. For most of that feeling has now gone from Washington—and from back in Maine and throughout the Nation, if the letters I receive are any indication of how the public now feels.

That former feeling of pride and confidence has now been replaced with a feeling of suspicion, distrust, lack of confidence, and some resentment—a feeling of resentment of the possibility of having been misled with reports that were too rosy and too sugar-coated and did not give the more disturbing facts.

Growing numbers of Americans are beginning to wonder just what is the situation in Cuba—just what did we accomplish or not accomplish back in October 1962 on the Cuban crisis—was the threat removed or not?

Now several Members of Congress are reporting that there is a heavy Russian military buildup in Cuba—some charging that all the missiles were not removed. The Kennedy administration denies the charges made by the Congressmen. The usually impeccably cool Secretary of Defense in his denial makes attacks on Members of Congress—and finds the lack of confidence so bad that he had to have a 2-hour national TV program.

The result is that again the American people are confused—they don't know who is telling them the truth—whether the Kennedy administration is telling them the truth—or whether Senators and Representatives, both Democrats and Republicans, are telling them the truth in their charges of a threatening Russian buildup in Cuba.

But this much they do know. First, they know that during the Cuban crisis, Khrushchev offered a deal to President Kennedy—a deal that Khrushchev would remove the Russian missiles in Cuba if Kennedy would remove the American missiles in Turkey. Americans were proud when President Kennedy turned that deal down. But now they wondered when they read within the past few days the announcement of President Kennedy that American missiles were being taken out of Turkey. While the reason given is obsolescence, Americans still wonder if a deal wasn't actually made during the crisis—with an agreement that the American missiles would be removed from Turkey after the crisis blew over. For the American public is more intelligent than perhaps some people realize—and the American public recognizes that the American missiles in Turkey now are hardly any more obsolete than they were during the October crisis just a little more than 3 months ago. They see that whatever the reason may be—that Khrushchev has achieved his objective with our missiles being removed from Turkey as he had demanded.

They remember the Kennedy ultimatum of on-site inspection—but now they see that there was no follow through on this—and now the Kennedy administration defensively admits it can't be really sure of what is in Cuba because it hasn't made on-the-ground inspections.

There is another fact that stands out in the mind of the American public—that fact is that Senator KENNETH KEATING was so

right so far in advance last year on the Russian military buildup in Cuba and the missile threat. They remember how the Kennedy administration denied his charges—how the Kennedy administration castigated Senator KEATING—how he was pilloried on the Senate floor by spokesmen for the Kennedy administration.

But they remember how subsequently the Kennedy administration had to admit how right Senator KEATING was and how wrong the Kennedy administration was at the very times the Kennedy administration was issuing heated denials and castigating Senator KEATING.

And now they see and hear Senator KEATING speaking up again and warning about a heavy Russian military buildup in Cuba—and again they see the Kennedy administration issuing heated denials and castigating Senator KEATING calling his warnings irresponsible and disgraceful.

But the memory of the American public is not so short as some would like it to be—and the feeling of the American public is that with Senator KEATING having been so right before, the American public is not quickly going to accept the claims of the Kennedy administration that Senator KEATING is wrong now—and is irresponsible and disgraceful. I think the American public is going to be inclined to believe that it is Senator KEATING who is telling them the truth and sounding a needed warning until the Kennedy administration can prove otherwise.

In fact, the American public can say now. "Why this is where we came in last year. It looks like a replay of the Keating-Kennedy match of 1962 in which KEATING scored a knockout and a victory for the American people getting the truth."

A further fact that stands out in the confusion of the charges, countercharges and denials that dominate the air in Washington now on the Cuban controversy is that the Democratic chairman of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee ordered an investigation into determining just how great was the reported Russian military buildup in Cuba. And in that investigation the CIA Director admits that there is a threat in Cuba.

To the American public, this action of investigation drowns out the heated denials of the Kennedy administration—for the American public recognizes that the Cuban situation has gotten so bad that a member of President Kennedy's own Democratic Party has ordered a congressional investigation of the matter.

Added to this controversy which is causing the American public to have doubts about what agreements really were made on Cuba, about how much we actually did stand up—or did not stand up to—Khrushchev in October 1963—of what happened behind the scenes as compared to what was told the American people at the time—of what is the danger now—what is the military situation—what is the actual truth in the matter—and how much is actually being given of the truth to the people by the Kennedy administration.

Added to this controversy is the recent declaration of the Attorney General, brother of President Kennedy, that no air cover had even been assured for the Bay of Pigs invasion. Some Congressmen have accused the Attorney General of attempting to rewrite history in such a statement. I make no such accusation against him. But I don't see what good purpose his declaration can accomplish. Despite his denial, millions of Americans will believe otherwise.

This much we do know. First, that the Bay of Pigs invasion ended in a fiasco—that it constituted one of the most humiliating defeats our country has ever suffered. Second, we know that President Kennedy

morning was offered by Rabbi Theodore Lewis, of Touro Synagogue, in my home city of Newport, R.I. Touro Synagogue is the oldest synagogue in the United States, and it is this year marking the 200th anniversary of its founding. It stands today as a symbol of an often-forgotten right in American society—the right to be different.

It is most fitting that we note this American right and this anniversary today because this week has also been designated as Brotherhood Week, a time when we pause to extend the hand of friendship and understanding to all Americans whatever their differences of race, color, or creed. Rabbi Lewis comes to us today as the living embodiment of all these traditions, handed down now through two centuries of Touro Synagogue's proud history of service to her congregation, to our city, and to the Nation.

I am happy indeed to welcome him to the Senate today.

RATIFICATION OF ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT BY MONTANA AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on February 7 I announced that the legislatures of six States had approved the anti-poll-tax amendment which the 87th Congress submitted for ratification last year.

Today, Mr. President, I am happy to announce that the legislatures of two more States have ratified the amendment, making eight States in all which have acted favorably. They are the State of Montana, which approved its ratifying resolution by a vote of 51 to 4, the Montana Assembly having approved its resolution 6 days earlier, on January 22, by a vote of 56 to 37; and the State of California, whose legislature, I have been informed, has approved the amendment, the California Senate by a vote of 34 to 0 and the California House by a vote of 70 to 3, final ratification becoming effective on February 7, 1963.

Mr. President, I especially wish to express my appreciation to our distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who directed much time and effort in the last few weeks to working with the leaders of the Montana Legislature in obtaining favorable action on the amendment. His assistance last year in obtaining Senate action here was indispensable.

I also wish, Mr. President, to extend my appreciation to my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], who cosponsored, vigorously supported, and has worked equally hard for ratification of the amendment by the legislature of his State.

Also, Mr. President, I wish to express my equally warm appreciation to the two distinguished Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. ENGLE], who also have worked valiantly from the very beginning in truly bipartisan spirit to obtain the gratifying results which have occurred in their great State.

SUBSIDIZATION OF BOHEMIA LIBRE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on February 8, 1963, the Washington Daily News published an article entitled "Has CIA Killed Anti-Castro Mag?"

The article describes the publication Bohemia Libre and the extent of its subsidization by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. The article reports that the subsidy apparently has been withdrawn.

At one point the article states:

According to this magazine's staffer, Bohemia Libre furnished a U.S. Senator with photos of the Russian buildup in Cuba and that didn't help the administration either. The Senator he named is currently a Democrat.

I do not know why my name was not used directly by the newspaper, when it was the senior Senator from Oregon who obviously was involved.

To set the record straight, I wish to say that these photographs were not furnished to me; they were offered to me. I responded by suggesting that the pictures be taken to the appropriate intelligence agencies of the U.S. Government. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that was the only appropriate response that I could make, or should have made, to the offer of the photographs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the text of the newspaper article, the telegram I received on January 24 from the publisher of Bohemia Libre, and my reply to him dated January 30.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 8, 1963]

DEATH OF A BOHEMIAN—HAS CIA KILLED 'ANTI-CASTRO MAG'?

Bohemia Libre, sensational anti-Castro weekly magazine, has quit publishing and some say the CIA blew the whistle on it. At any rate, publication has been suspended. For how long, nobody knows; it may be forever.

Reports from Miami's Cuban colony are that the Central Intelligence Agency had been subsidizing it, and a couple of weeks ago, got tired. CIA itself doesn't care to discuss rumors.

Bohemia, one of the most spectacular and successful Spanish language periodicals in the Western Hemisphere when it was published in its palatial plant in Havana, idolized Castro both before and after he took over Cuba.

FERVID SUPPORT

During Bohemia's Havana days, its odd-ball publisher, Don Miguel Angel Quevedo, from his exotic modern office paneled in rare woods, complete with lavish washroom with lavender bidet, directed uncritical and fervid support for whatever Fidel said or did.

Bohemia gave U.S. newsmen covering Cuba—such as the famous Latin America Reporter Jules duBois of the Chicago Tribune—the hero treatment as long as they sympathized with Castro's revolution. When they became disillusioned, Bohemia exposed the same U.S. reporters as spies, agents, and colonels in the CIA.

Finally Castro's Red-glared eyes covetously focused on Bohemia's expensive printing

plant and Publisher Quevedo packed his bags and barely made the plane.

So he joined the exiles.

Bohemia thus became Bohemia Libre in exile and in sheer vitriol outdid all other Castro critics (no mean feat, these days).

IRONY

It is an irony, say Cuban exiles, that Bohemia now is portrayed in the very role it accused U.S. newsmen of playing: agent of the CIA.

There's no doubt that Bohemia Libre's spectacular format and content—it's a sort of hot-licks, Police Gazette version of Life magazine—made effective propaganda in several Caribbean areas, as well as among Cuban exiles in the United States, at least until the Bay of Pigs disaster in April, 1961.

There is also no doubt that since then, it has been not so sharp a tool. But, there is also no doubt that the Red propagandists in Havana would crow over its final demise.

Here are several versions of why Bohemia hasn't been going to press recently:

1. A cartoon of the Kennedy family scheduled for page 1 on January 1, was so insulting that the CIA lowered the boom.

2. That knowledge of CIA support had leaked so that it had ruined the magazine's effectiveness.

3. That the magazine has simply lost its effectiveness anyway, since the groups it supported lost the Bay of Pigs battle.

4. That if the actual size of the CIA's subsidy of Bohemia Libre got into the hands of Congress, it would embarrass the Kennedy administration—and the CIA—just about as thoroughly as the Bay of Pigs disaster itself.

5. White House adviser Arthur Schlesinger found Bohemia Libre "too conservative," according to one of the magazine's editorial workers, who also said there were financial problems.

According to this magazine's staffer, Bohemia Libre furnished a U.S. Senator with photos of the Russian buildup in Cuba and that didn't help with the administration, either. The Senator he named is currently a Democrat.

A MILLION

As to the size of the alleged subsidy; depending on who's talking, CIA spent more than a million dollars on Bohemia Libre, or spent \$2,500 a week on it for a couple of years, or paid just the office rent—\$2,400 a month.

Bohemia Libre may not be as dead as its recent failures to publish indicate. Bohemia's boss and staff are well known as lively and resourceful people among such interests as sugar, rum and various export firms, and recently Publisher Quevedo was in Puerto Rico reportedly trying to interest the "statehood-for-Puerto Rico" group. Mr. Quevedo also has his eye on certain interests in the Dominican Republic and in Venezuela as possible angels.

So far, reports have it, no angels are flying.

JANUARY 30, 1963.

Mr. MIGUEL ANGEL QUEVEDO,
Editor and Publisher,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. ANGEL QUEVEDO: I have your telegram of January 24 offering me a collection of photographs on Cuba's military strength.

Although I appreciate your support of my course of action in regard to Cuba and the spirit in which your telegram was sent, I suggest that it would be more useful to make these photographs available to the agencies of the Government who are responsible for collecting intelligence concerning Cuba.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

on vocational education and the very great role vocational education can play, but is not now playing, in providing jobs for our young people. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record, and I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EDUCATION, JOB TRAINING VITAL

A few figures quickly gave the dimensions of one of America's critical problems.

In the decade of the 1960's automation and related forms of technical change are expected to eliminate 2.5 million jobs. In the same decade, 26 million young people will reach working age, twice as many as in the 1950's. To give them employment, the Nation will have to create 25,000 new jobs every week. The Nation will also have to see to it that the young people are trained to handle the jobs.

How inadequately job creation and job preparation are now being accomplished is suggested by the January employment report of the U.S. Department of Labor. It shows that 13 percent of the teenagers seeking employment and 9 percent of those 20 to 25 could not find jobs in 1962. For non-whites the problem is particularly serious. The unemployment rate runs in excess of 60 percent for urban Negro boys.

Approximately one young jobseeker out of every three enters the labor market as a high school dropout. He lacks not only job skills but the scholastic background to acquire them. A Department of Labor official who visited Milwaukee recently pointed out that apprenticeship programs were closed to dropouts and that the armed services were rejecting virtually all youngsters who "can't show a high school diploma." He said further that only 5 percent of present unskilled jobs would still exist by 1970.

Retraining is looked to as the hopeful means of preparing workers displaced by automation for new and more demanding jobs. For youths who haven't become workers in any real sense of the word, the hope lies in vocational training—training that will excite young people and hold them until they acquire skills to get and hold good jobs.

How effective is our present vocational training program? Not very, according to many studies. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch calls for reformation of vocational schools. A survey by the Taconic Foundation reports: "It is extremely questionable whether the training absorbed by vocational high school graduates is useful to them in getting employment and advancing on the job."

The Post-Dispatch makes a further point: Last year 44.5 percent of Federal vocational education funds went for agricultural training although barely 1 young person in 15 can look forward to farm labor. At a time when emphasis should be on orderly transfer of people from the land to the city, this allocation of funds makes little sense.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is

anticipated that tomorrow the Senate will consider nominations on the Executive Calendar; committee assignments and selection of chairmen of committees; and also a continuing resolution for the special committees whose authority has expired.

FIFTY-MILE HIKES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, this Nation is periodically swept by various activities known as the latest craze. Currently, as we are all well aware, 50-mile hikes are the thing to do. Mr. President, I am not against 50-mile hikes, for those young enough and well enough conditioned they are probably a worthwhile form of exercise. And certainly anything that calls attention to the need for physical fitness should not be deprecated.

However much some of these hikes may be only publicity gimmicks, not all of them are that alone. I was particularly pleased to learn that when certain young people of my State took up this activity, for example, they added a different twist that gave an entirely new meaning to hiking.

Mr. President, the students at Northwest Center, a junior college in Powell, Wyo., realized that the first 50-mile hikers in that State would receive considerable publicity, and they decided this publicity should be put to good use. So, instead of marching for the glory of the school or club, they marched to publicize the need for clothing for the children of Teraco, Peru, a community high in the Andes Mountains. These students were well aware of the lack of adequate clothing in that remote village because a former student leader, Walter VandeVeegaete, is now serving there in the Peace Corps.

I am most happy to report that this combination of youthful spirits and humanitarian purpose found a sympathetic and enthusiastic reception in the hearts of Wyoming's citizens. These students set out yesterday to walk—in 1 day—from Powell to Cody, Wyo., and return, a distance in excess of 50 miles. And when the eight survivors, including two young women, struggled across the finish line they were met by the news that more than 1 ton of clothing had already been collected and much more was on the way. One of the marchers, incidentally, was Walter VandeVeegaete's sister, Ramona.

Mr. President, we have heard much in recent years about the sad state of our youth. They grow up in luxury, critics say, and are soft and selfish, neither understanding or caring about the traditions that made this country great. The activities of the Peace Corps and the tremendous job done by our youth, in less than normal American living conditions, was the first large-scale event to give the lie to this criticism of our youth.

I would that our adults could match our youth, not only in education, but in ingenuity in ideas.

The activities of the college students in Powell, Wyo., have served as further evidence that our national ideals are still strong in the hearts and souls of our

youth, and that they have displayed typical American ingenuity to further a worthwhile cause. They have demonstrated this in preserving the national ideals which we associate with the history of our country. This is the spirit of cooperation which has helped to build the frontier, whether it be old or new. It is very much alive today.

DEATH OF OTTO D. SCHMIDT, RECIPIENT OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in 1906, while in the service of the U.S. Navy, Otto D. Schmidt reacted heroically to the explosion of a boiler aboard the U.S.S. *Bennington*. For his actions in saving the lives of a number of the crew, he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, this Nation's highest military honor.

From 1922 until his retirement in 1948, Mr. Schmidt was an employee of the post office in Norfolk, Nebr. He walked some 69,000 miles carrying the mail to his neighbors in Norfolk.

Mr. Schmidt served his country honorably both as a seaman and a civilian. On Sunday, February 10, 1963, he passed away. His death reduced the number of those awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor now living to 290, only 14 of whom are peacetime recipients. Mr. Schmidt was the last living Nebraskan to be given this medal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the article about Mr. Otto D. Schmidt, of Blair, Nebr., published in the Norfolk, Nebr., Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be published in the Record, as follows:

EX-NORFOLK MEDAL OF HONOR HERO IS DEAD

Otto D. Schmidt, 78, Blair, the only Norfolk resident ever to wear the Congressional Medal of Honor, died Sunday at Blair after a lingering illness.

Funeral arrangements are pending.

Mr. Schmidt, a retired Norfolk mail carrier, was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor along with nine other Navy men for heroism in the explosion of a boiler in the U.S.S. *Bennington* off the coast of San Diego in 1906.

After the explosion, which killed 113 of the 136 men aboard, Mr. Schmidt ran to the deck and helped rescue some of the wounded. He also went into the blast-wrecked boiler room and pulled out injured men.

For a few years before World War II, Mr. Schmidt had the distinction of being the only resident of Nebraska to wear the Congressional Medal of Honor.

He came to Norfolk in 1917 and started working for the post office in 1922. He retired August 31, 1948, after having walked about 69,000 miles.

After his retirement at Norfolk Mr. Schmidt went to Blair to live.

He is survived by one son, Dale, of San Monica. He was preceded in death by his wife.

COMMENT ON PRAYER OFFERED TODAY BY RABBI THEODORE LEWIS, OF TOURQ SYNAGOGUE, NEWPORT, R.I.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is most appropriate that our opening prayer this

NEW YORK, N.Y., January 24, 1963.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bohemia Libre magazine congratulates and supports you on Cuban military buildup offering you a sensational collection of photographs received yesterday from underground sources on Fidel Castro's military strength.

MIGUEL ANGEL QUEVEDO.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, to my mind, this episode emphasizes the whole question of the extent of the subsidization of Cuban exiled groups and publication outlets. It raises in my mind a question of how much it is costing the American taxpayers to keep publications and political organizations of this kind operating among the Cuban refugees.

A still more serious question is, For what purposes does the CIA subsidize them? These Cuban refugees are well known in Congress as a source of allegations about both the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion and, now, the state of Soviet military forces in Cuba. Bohemia Libre modestly calls its own pictures "sensational." With the current spate of congressional reports, as opposed to administration reports, the Russian buildup, which cite alleged missile installations and alleged numbers of Russian troops in Cuba, one must assume that other Members of Congress have been offered not only pictures but countless allegations, as well, by the Cuban refugees, their political organs, and their publicity organs.

I am very much concerned about the practice of the CIA of giving financial subsidies to these organizations and publications. It raises the suspicion that they can be used by the Agency to whip up and inflame American opinion and, in effect, to influence the making of policy on Cuba in a way that the CIA is not permitted to do directly. It raises the suspicion that the taxpayers' money is being used to promote a particular policy favored by the Agency, one which may not be in keeping with or may even be contrary to that of the administration.

The CIA's relationship with the exiled groups points again, in my opinion, to the need for congressional supervision of the Agency.

Therefore, Mr. President, today I serve notice that I plan to answer to Mr. Allen Dulles magazine article of recent date in which he seeks to support the thesis that the CIA should not be subject to a watchdog congressional committee. Again I state—as I have stated for years in the Senate—that the CIA should be brought under congressional control, for the simple reason that in democratic America no agency should be given police-state powers. In effect, the CIA exercises police-state powers. They should be taken away from it, and the Democratic administration should take them away from it.

Later this week or next week I shall support that thesis by a rather detailed presentation of some CIA policies which I do not believe are in the interest of maintaining peace in the world. The CIA seeks to justify them on the ground that if one is going to beat Russia, Russian methods must be used. Mr.

President, we hear this argument—"The end justifies the means"—used by too many Government agencies, State and national. In my judgment, such an argument endangers very precious principles of freedom. I cannot reconcile some of the activities of the CIA with the maintenance of precious rights of freedom to the American people. Such secrecy should be stopped.

The little experience I have recently had in connection with the pictures which were offered to me bears out my point. Apparently when a magazine or a newspaper such as Bohemia Libre offers to a Senator information which deals with the foreign policy of the United States, one cannot be sure but what it is being offered with the approval of CIA.

AMERICAN-ISRAEL RELATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a speech on American-Israel relations, delivered in New York City on February 10 by one of the great living Americans, Ambassador Philip M. Klutznick. For the past 2 years Mr. Klutznick has very effectively served our Government as U.S. representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Recently he resigned. I am satisfied that he resigned for two compelling reasons: One, health; the other, to take care of his personal business affairs.

In making this request, I wish to say that in the wonderful speech on American-Israel relations which he made in New York City on February 10, he has left with us an account of his views on that subject which I think every Member of Congress should read. His speech is an excellent one; and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMERICAN-ISRAEL RELATIONS

(By Philip M. Klutznick to B'nai Zion, New York City, February 10, 1963)

At your annual dinner a few years ago, you honored a Senator who later became President of the United States. He discussed American-Israel relationships in positive and candid terms. He amplified these views during the campaign for the presidency in a brilliant and constructive address in August 1960. In it he set some difficult and challenging goals for himself. In my 2 years of intimate concern with events inside the administration affecting American-Israel relationships, I found no gap between President Kennedy's views as he stated them earlier and his earnest and dedicated performance as our Nation's Chief Executive.

As a consequence, I am saddened by rumors attending my recent resignation. In the English Jewish press in Canada, the United Kingdom, and Israel, and through some editorial comment in the United States, it was suggested that the real cause of my resignation was my alleged dissatisfaction with the administration's attitude toward Israel. Such rumors are complete and unfounded nonsense. In a matter so vital, I would not play fast and loose with either the administration or the Jewish community. In spite of problems that have arisen and may again arise, I am proud to have been as-

sociated officially with the administration. I am convinced that President Kennedy is performing in the best interests of the United States and in keeping with a positive, progressive, and constructive policy in American-Israel relationships.

I appreciate fully your desire to do me honor. The devotion of B'nai Zion to the Jewish National Fund I have shared since boyhood. My mind goes back to the days when in countless Jewish homes the only positive symbol of hope for the realization of the dream of centuries was the little blue box—the pushka of the JNF. It is for this and reasons of long friendship that I am honored to be here tonight. I knew when your committee called on me that I would be leaving the Government service at the end of 1962. I felt that I would want to make public expression on American-Israel relationships. This was the platform from which our President chose, while he was a Senator, to clarify his views on the subject. It certainly is an appropriate place for an American, who is a Jew, to do likewise. This is especially true after 2 years in which diplomatic propriety demanded a high measure of public silence.

Let there be no illusions about my official role. My duties as a U.S. Ambassador in the United Nations concerned economic, social, and financial matters. The politically surcharged item of American-Israel relations was never assigned to me either at the Permanent Mission or during General Assembly sessions. Whatever I did in that regard was informal either at the request of my superiors or at my own suggestion. But, I was always guided by the proprieties of relationship within a government.

It has been an edifying experience for me to watch the American-Jewish community for the first time in years from a relatively detached vantage point. No less interesting has been the opportunity to observe the performance of Israel and its diplomatic corps at close quarters and in its natural habitat where we met as fellow diplomats each with unalloyed commitment to serve different though friendly countries.

It is my conclusion that the State of Israel and its personnel have matured and grown rapidly both in their understanding and in their performance in the international arena. On the other hand, the American-Jewish community seems to be floundering. We are still trying to understand our own role within this our own country and in our relationship to Israel and other Jewish communities of the world. This is not a criticism. It is a sincere observation made in good faith out of the hope that we can do something about it.

This is an enormous reaction in our Jewish community when incidents involved in American-Israel relationships arise. Therefore, trying to anticipate and to understand this relationship may be the very key to an accelerated maturity as well as a more effective role for the American-Jewish community. For all problems are by no means solved.

By now, we know that regional tensions like those in the Middle East are more difficult, if not impossible, of solution, so long as the struggle between the West and the East is unresolved or unstabilized. There is just too much room for competition for temporary favors sought and granted by competing sides to permit solid and lasting solutions.

We are living in an unusual epoch. Big powers possess the greatest and most destructive military strength in history. But it remains virtually immobilized while big powers compete for the friendship of small, weak, and poor nations. The meek have truly interited the earth. Any sane and reasonable attitude toward American-Israel relationships must reflect intelligently on

this reality. Whether we approve of certain relationships or not, it must be expected that our Nation, in its own national interest, will maintain friendly and helpful contacts with many nations, including not only Israel but Arab, African, Latin American and Asian states which appear to merit such consideration. The peace of the world requires it.

Another aspect is self-evident but bears repetition. On many issues, Israel aligns herself with the West (she has one of the best, if not the best, records of voting on the same side as the United States in the United Nations among nontreaty states). Yet Israel is sovereign and as such acts as she should in what she considers her own best interest. It is no less true of our own Nation. Israel is not a satellite of the United States or of the West; nor is the United States a satellite of Israel. Both Nations are blessed with able, intelligent and energetic leadership. Where energy, intelligence and movement are present, possibilities for occasional differences arise even while the fundamental relationship is sound and friendly.

Then again, the United States maintains relationships with many friendly nations, some of which are unfriendly to one another. The Israel-Arab situation is not unique. The United States is friendly to both Pakistan and India. Has this solved the Kashmir bitterness? The United States did its best to help set at rest the West Iria conflict between the Netherlands and Indonesia. During the process, Indonesia moved closer to the Soviet and the Dutch publicly berated us at home. Or one might ponder on the discomfort of trying to be a constructive friend to Portugal and to South Africa while trying to maintain the United States' historic belief in the self-determination of peoples. This has not made life with either Portugal or South Africa or, for that matter, with some of the new African nations, a bed of roses. Need one make the point more effectively than to note the occasions when the United States found itself at odds with its oldest ally, France, including the startling events of recent days, and with its close and old ally, the United Kingdom. In an overwrought, exceedingly tense and fluid world, we must expect momentary incongruities. These are usually passing phases with little impact on long-term interests and more profound mutualities.

The closest of friends among the nations of the world go through periods of disagreement, and foes find moments of agreement. Consequently there is always the possibility that differences can arise between the Governments of the United States and Israel. When in the judgment of the governments of states that are friendly national interests conflict, it is not tragic so long as basic and fundamental relationships remain sound.

It is dangerous to elect the role of a prophet but our people have a tradition that encourages the Jew to try prophecy. There are several areas that in the future could bring about momentary or ephemeral differences between the United States and the State of Israel even with as friendly and understanding an administration as that headed by President Kennedy. I would hope that this will not happen but in today's world, anything can happen. Let us examine a few possibilities for a moment.

1. This administration believes deeply in the right and the duty of a state to defend itself from actual or threatened aggression. The recent most classic example is Cuba. At times in the past, and possibly in the future, there have been different approaches to this question by the United States and by Israel. Our Government has held that a member of the United Nations should exhaust the opportunities which that organization affords for peaceful settlement before actually shooting at the other side or shooting back

in retaliation. Even in the case of Cuba, the United States took steps short of gunfire when its whole existence was threatened until the Organization of American States and the Security Council of the United Nations examined the problem.

Israel has openly expressed doubt that it can rely on the Security Council to protect it against Arab States. She has felt, not without some cause, that the Soviet veto is always available so long as the Soviet-Arab flirtation continues. Our country has felt that anticipating a veto does not justify refusing to present a case before retaliation.

It is my estimate that currently there is a better understanding on this question between the United States and Israel. Hopefully, this, with all of its implied risks, might avoid the kind of misunderstanding in the Jewish community that arose in the spring of 1962 when the Security Council censured Israel. But if Israel honestly fears its chances in the Security Council and therefore avoids initiating Security Council's processes when attacked, there is the danger of a repetition of the unhappy events of last year. If this should happen, the important thing will be to determine whether it actually affects the long-term friendly relations between the two countries or is it only an unfortunate, but nevertheless passing phase.

2. Let us take a calm but brief look at the Arab refugee problem. The United States and Israel would both like to see this problem solved. Both countries are generally moved by humanitarianism. But sovereign states cannot afford generosity if other vital interests are seriously and adversely affected. Israel properly fears for its security in the event of large scale repatriation. The sine qua non of sovereignty is the security of a nation's people. I am completely sanguine that the Kennedy administration would never deliberately and consciously encourage a plan which would endanger the security of Israel, no matter how urgent it regards the desirability of an Arab refugee solution. Yet, it is inconceivable that the Congress will continue to make substantial appropriations for UNWRA much longer without evidence that a solution is being actively sought or is on the horizon. It seems patent that both countries agree completely on three things:

- (a) it is politically desirable that the problem be solved;
- (b) a solution must not adversely affect the security of Israel; and
- (c) that simple humanitarianism demands that the problem be solved.

But there can be differences dictated by differing exposures and accountabilities of the governments involved. These differences, if they arise, can only yield to patient and painstaking negotiation between the governments involved. The substitute of polemics will only complicate, not clarify.

Recent events tend to negate the prospect of a serious split on this issue. On a particular amendment in the General Assembly, the United States and Israel stood alone in voting against it. The reasons differed, but the fact created much comment in the halls of the United Nations. The debate in the 17th General Assembly and the voting pattern suggest that maybe basic and overt differences can be avoided. Nevertheless, I am convinced that, in keeping with his public pledges, the President and this administration will try for achievable solutions but with sincere and intelligent regard for Israel's security as well as the welfare of the refugees.

3. In another area of potential static—assistance to states not friendly to Israel—I feel more at home as a result of my recent work. One of the oldest foreign aid debates is whether a donor state should disburse aid to states unless they are allied with it formally and informally. This ques-

tion loses some of its steam if foreign aid is approached from a moral point of view. The United States is the richest and most powerful Nation in the world. Like a rich and powerful individual, it has some responsibility to those less fortunate. How and to what extent it discharges this is within its own control. But, if it acts for selfish reasons alone, the decisions may be self-defeating. Just like philanthropy distributed for self-aggrandizement loses its flavor, so foreign aid used to buy friendships rarely succeeds.

On the other hand, one must candidly recognize that if foreign aid strengthens a country, such added strength can be used for better or for worse. A nation sincerely trying to develop economically has little time and less resource for military adventure. Self-defense is all it can afford at best. Some states have not yet learned this truth.

I believe that the hope for peace in the world depends on the elevation of the economic and social standards of many peoples. This is a fundamental objective of the United Nations Charter. It has symbolized the policy of the United States in this post-war era. It can be honestly argued whether aid extended to certain Arab States will blunt the edge of their antagonisms toward Israel or feed the flame of their hostility. But it cannot be disputed that the presence of a constructive U.S. influence should tend to lessen potential troubles.

This is a disturbing problem. When a state that proclaims belligerence and threatens hostilities against a neighbor is provided food and credits, it is reasonable to assume that it is strengthened to commit war even though the aid itself is directed to other channels. A historic analysis of such situations will demonstrate that there are risks in either aiding or withholding aid in a dangerous world. On the balance, the odds should favor establishing a constructive U.S. influence if possible and in elevating the economic and social level of the people themselves. It is foolhardy to do so recklessly without careful and rational examination accompanied by constant review.

So long as the United States is in the position of making choices and decisions that could affect the cause of peace and the interests of the free world, questions will continue to arise as to whether our policy at a given moment promotes the easing or heightening of tensions in the Middle East. We must be careful to relate what happens to policy objectives, to the degree of caution that is exercised and to the frequency of the review of potentialities. Perhaps, under such circumstances, any open split involving friends of Israel will be averted.

But actually, it is not these dramatic and isolated issues that provide the basic tests of American-Israel relations any more than they do of U.S. relations with many friends. The real tests rest on far more fundamental matters than votes in the United Nations or whether a little more or a little less aid should or should not have been given to a country not friendly to Israel or whether solutions for the Arab refugee problem should be sought in one way or another openly or clandestinely. The real question is will a great power help a relatively new and struggling small state to maintain its independence and its sovereignty if its security is endangered and will it help that state overcome an adverse economic balance so it can escape national poverty.

In these matters of real life or death I speak with complete conviction. The independence and security of Israel are an element of the U.S. foreign policy. This is not a new policy. But in recent months it passed the acid test. The United States has never provided major arms assistance to the State of Israel. Other countries have done

	UNCLASSIFIED	CONFIDENTIAL	SECRET
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP			
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	DCI		<i>ink</i> <i>WE</i>
2			
3	1007		
4			
5			
6			
	ACTION	DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY
	APPROVAL	DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION
	COMMENT	FILE	RETURN
	CONCURRENCE	INFORMATION	SIGNATURE
Remarks: Attached is an extract from the <u>Congressional Record</u> of 18 February containing statements made by Senator Morse against the Agency in connection with the recent <u>Daily News</u> article. As indicated, Senator Morse has stated he plans to have much more to say on this subject.			
<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 60px; margin: 10px auto; width: 300px;"></div> <p style="text-align: center;">Assistant Legislative Counsel</p> <p>cc: DCI, DDCI</p>			
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER			
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.			DATE
UNCLASSIFIED			SECRET